DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 690 IR 051 261

AUTHOR	Johns, Claude, Jr., Ed.; Moore, Beverly, Ed.
TITLE	Colorado Academic Library Master Plan. Revised Edition.
INSTITUTION	University of Southern Colorado, Pueblo.
PUB DATE	Mar 85
NOTE	88p.; For an earlier master plan, see ED 226 751.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; Higher Education; Library Administration; Library Collection Development; Library Facilities; Library Networks; *Library Planning; Library Role; *Library Services; Library Statistics; *Long Range Planning; State Programs; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado

ABSTRACT

This master plan for Colorado academic libraries assesses current strengths and weaknesses of public and private academic libraries in the state and forecasts the role of academic libraries in support of higher education. The plan consists of a series of recommendations divided into six related and overlapping sections: access, collection development, library services, networking, administration, and master plan implementation and maintenance. Each recommendation identifies a course of action which should be undertaken. A few recommendations also incorporate goals considered so important that attention must be called to them even though a prescribed activity and time frame for implementation cannot be offered. Prior to the specific recommendations, the document includes: a history of the Academic Library Master Plan; a directory of members of the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan Committee; an introduction; role and mission statements; and statewide accomplishments between 1982 and 1984 in each of the six areas identified above. Numerous appendices provide specific guidelines and library statistics. A glossary is included. The appendixes include access policy guidelines, the reciprocal borrowing agreement, guidelines for the formulation of collection development policies, and library and media center space guidelines. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261690

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COLORADO Academic Library Master Plan

Revised Edition

March 1985

Co-Editors

Claude Johns and Beverly Moore

IR051261

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Beverly Moore
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLORADO
Academic Library
Master Plan

Revised Edition

March 1985

Co-Editors

Claude Johns and Beverly Moore

COLORADO ACADEMIC LIBRARY MASTER PLAN

Revised Edition

April 1985

Co-Editors

Claude Johns and Beverly Moore

The co-editors acknowledge, with grateful appreciation, the professional assistance of three colleagues, Marcia Ingerson (formerly with CCHE); Donald Barrett, Assistant Director for Public Services, USAF Air Force Academy Library; and Ronald Camp, Director of the University of Northern Colorado's Educational Media Services. The Appendix on Space Planning was written by Messrs. Barrett and Camp. We also acknowledge the superior word processing skills of LaVada Leinweber of UNC.

The co-editors acknowledge, with grateful appreciation, the professional assistance of three colleagues, Marcia Ingerson (formerly with CCHE); Donald Barrett, Assistant Director for Public Services, USAF Air Force Academy Library; and Ronald Camp, Director of the University of Northern Colorado's Educational Media Services. The Appendix on Space Planning was written by Messrs. Barrett and Camp. We also acknowledge the superior word processing skills of LaVada Leinweber of UNC.

COLORADO ACADEMIC LIBRARY MASTER PLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

History of Academic Library Master Plan 3

Colorado Academic Library Master Plan Committee 5

Introduction 6

Role and Mission Statements 8

Accomplishments 1982-1984

- Access 9
- Library Services 12
- Networking 14
- Administration 16
- Master Plan Implementation and Maintenance 17

Recommendations with Background Statements

- Access 19
- Collection Development 25
- Library Services 28
- Networking 31
- Administration 33
- Master Plan Implementation and Maintenance 36

Appendixes 39

Glossary 80

HISTORY OF MASTER PLAN

In the spring of 1980 the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) observed that academic libraries were not included in the current Colorado Higher Education Master Plan.* Subsequently, CCHE took the initiative in requesting the development of an academic library master plan for Colorado. At a meeting which included representatives of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the State Department of Education, and the Colorado Library Association, it was decided to have co-chairpersons: one from the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) and one from the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries (CCAL). It was also decided to have a resource/liaison team of three to work with the committee: one each from Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Colorado State Library (CSL), and the Association of Public College and University Presidents (APCUP). Other committee members were chosen by the co-chairpersons with suggestions from CCHE and CSL to provide a balanced representation by size, type, and geographical location of academic libraries.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the academic library master plan was determined at a meeting held October 14, 1980. In attendance were Patricia Breivik, co-chairperson from CARL; Anne Marie Falsone, CSL; Mike Herbison, co-chairperson from CCAL; Marcia Ingerson and Charles Manning, CCHE. This stated purpose was:

> To assess current strengths and weaknesses of academic libraries in the State, and to project the potential roles of academic libraries in support of higher education in Colorado.

It was agreed that the study should include implementation plans to achieve success in fulfilling the defined roles, that indications of needs and/or opportunities which transcend the capabilities of individual institutions should be provided, and that non-State supported academic libraries and other libraries should be considered as appropriate.

This group also determined that the library plan, or parts thereof, snould eventually be included in the master plans of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library with the understanding that, if editing or excerpting from the plan was needed for use in such documents, such efforts would be negotiated with the Planning Committee so that a mutually acceptable document would result. Endorsements by other key groups such as APCUP, the Colorado Association of Community and Junior College Presidents (CACJCP), and academic governing boards were also to be sought.

*A Plan and a Process for Postsecondary Education in Colorado: 1978-79 through 1982-83, Access and Quality.

The Colorado Academic Master Plan Committee held its first meeting November 6, 1980, during the Colorado Library Association's annual conference in Durango. Based upon comments and suggestions received at a session open to all conference participants, the Committee adopted the following objectives for the Master Plan:

1. to view the academic libraries of the State as related parts of a whole, each providing access to the resources of all;

2. to focus and highlight problem areas and areas for cooperation among all academic libraries;

3. to provide guidelines for self-examination of library role and mission;

4. to establish a means for effectively coordinating academic library concerns with external agencies and institutions;

5. to provide an organized mechanism for libraries to enter the decision-making process in matters affecting libraries, research, and instruction; and

6. to provide focus, direction, and guidelines for long-range planning of individual academic libraries.

Funds for the preparation of the original report were provided in part by the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title III, administered by the Colorado State Library.

The planning process was completed between November 6, 1980, and early Spring of 1982. In the Fall of 1981 drafts were sent to all library directors and subsequently an open meeting was held at the Colorado Library Association 1981 conference. Copies of the next draft were sent to all university and college presidents in addition to their library directors and members of other concerned groups.

The Colorado Academic Library Master Plan was completed in the Spring of 1982. Since that time, the Plan has been presented either by a member of the Committee or through written memo to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Colorado Council of Library Development, Association of Public College and University Presidents, Colorado Association of Community and Junior College Presidents, and most governing boards.

By the Spring of 1984 several recommendations have been completed and progress made in many others. Due to changing circumstances, a few recommendations are no longer relevant.

The Colorado Academic Library Committee reviewed the Plan in a day-long retreat held March 30, 1984, at the Air Force Academy. The necessary revisions and updates determined at this meeting are the basis for this revised edition of the Master Plan.

COLORADO ACADEMIC LIBRARY MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE

Beverly A. Moore, Co-Chairperson 84/85
University Library
University of Southern Colorado
Pueblo, Colorado 81001
549-2361
(CCAL Representative)

Dr. Claude Johns, Co-Chairperson 84/85
Michener Library
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80639
351-2601
(CARL Representative)

Leo W. Cabell 85/86
Norlin Library
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309
492-7511
(Research Library)

Anne Marie Falsone
Colorado State Library
1362 Lincoln
Denver, Colorado 80203
866-3695

John Garralda 86/87
Leslie J. Savage Library
Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado 81230
953-2053
(Western Slope Library)

Josephine Hall 84/85
Learning Materials Center
Front Range Community College
3645 W. 112th Avenue
Westminster, Colorado 80030
466-8811
(Community College Library)

Marcia Ingerson
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
1300 Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80203
866-2726
(CCHE Support Staff Member)

Lt. Col. Reiner (Swiss) Schaeffer 85/86
Air Force Academy Library
U.S. Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80840
472-2590
(Specialized Academic Library)

Andrew D. Scrimgeour 84/85
Dayton Memorial Library
Regis College
5000 Lowell Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80221
458-4030, Ext. 3553
(Non-State Supported College Library)

Richard VanWye 85/86
Library/Resource Center
Loretto Heights College
3001 South Federal Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80236
936-8441, Ext. 288
(Four-Year College Library)

INTRODUCTION

The 1982 Master Plan was written to address the following developments:

- the information explosion
- the rapid obsolescence of knowledge
- technological advances in telecommunications and computerization
- unusually high inflation rates on library materials
- the impact of the rapid population growth in the State
- the great diversity in students' academic abilities
- the need to individualize the learning process
- increased adult learning

These factors affect libraries at both public and private institutions in Colorado and argue for continued reexamination of the role of all academic libraries in higher education. Such an effort, however, can be meaningful only if academic libraries are examined not as entities in themselves but rather as an integral part of the higher education system in Colorado. Traditional measurements of linear feet of shelving or number of books and microforms cannot be significant apart from their being a means to accomplishing stated educational goals and objectives. The implementation of the recommendations of the Master Plan represents a major step in defining the educational role of Colorado's academic libraries.

Not only are Academic libraries central to Colorado's effort to provide its citizens with quality and equitable higher education opportunities, but also serve as a valuable resource to the citizens of Colorado. The academic libraries and media centers individually and collectively support the goals of their institutions to provide quality instruction, public service, and research. These efforts are enhanced by cooperative library activities which offer public access to print and non-print resources of not only Colorado but also world-wide.

The Master Plan recognizes that Colorado academic libraries are related to parts of a whole, each providing access to the resources of all. While recognizing the necessity for basic collections and services on each campus, the plan also acknowledges existing variations in depths of collections (related to academic programming) and the need to build on existing strengths. Moreover, consideration is given throughout to the relationship of academic libraries to other types of libraries, library organizations, and the Colorado Regional Library Service Systems with which most of the academic libraries are affiliated.

The Master Plan consists of a series of recommendations which are divided into six related and overlapping sections: access, collection development, library services, networking, administration, and Master Plan implementation and

maintenance. While the recommendations do not represent a comprehensive list of concerns facing academic libraries, each recommendation identifies some course of action which is needed and should be undertaken. In addition, a few recommendations incorporate goals which are so important that attention must be called to them even though a prescribed activity and time frame for implementation cannot be offered at this time.

The plan of action designed into the Master Plan is one of distributed responsibility. To coordinate the activities, a Colorado Academic Library Committee has been established. Distributed responsibility for implementation is seen as both necessary and desirable for three reasons: (1) the improbability of significant additional funding for the activities outlined, (2) the expertise available through existing special interest groups within the academic library community, and (3) the belief that by involving more of the academic library community in its implementation, the Master Plan will receive broader support.

In addition to library groups, the nature of certain recommendations require them to be directed toward institutional administrations, governing boards, or State agencies. All activities outlined in the Master Plan are designed to be complementary to existing institutional and State operational procedures and protocols.

Role and Mission

The academic libraries of the State are committed to provide the needed resources and the opportunities necessary for students to become effective information consumers, to enhance their formal education, and to prepare them for lifelong learning. To support individual institutions of higher learning in fulfilling their functions and obligations, Colorado academic libraries will provide:

1. resources and professional/technical assistance which complement and support existing and developing programs;

2. access to the intellectual and cultural heritage of Colorado, the nation, and civilization at large;

3. information services necessary for knowledgeable decision making in the academic, business, and civic communities; and

4. opportunities for people to become efficient information consumers.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS 1982-1984

Although the Colorado Academic Libraries Master Plan has been completed for only two years, significant progress has been made in many areas. This second edition reports the following accomplishments.

ACCESS

- The means of identifying, locating, cataloging, delivering, and receiving information.

I. Recommendation: Written Policy on User Access

A written policy on user access should be developed by September 1, 1983, by each academic library in the State based upon the Access policy guidelines developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries. (See Appendix A.) Each statement will be on file at the State Library, available to the entire library community, and reviewed periodically by the respective institutions.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

As of February 21, 1985, the following libraries have completed their access policy statement and filed it with the State Librarian:

Adams State College
Arapahoe Community College
Auraria Libraries
Colorado Northwestern Community College
Colorado School of Mines
Front Range Community College
Regis College
United States Air Force Academy
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Denver
University of Northern Colorado
University of Southern Colorado
Western State College

II. Recommendation: Reciprocal Borrowing Agreement

A standard written agreement for reciprocal borrowing among academic libraries will be available on a Statewide basis for endorsement by libraries by Fall 1983. (See Appendix B.) The initiative for developing the statement of agreement and the subsequent coordination of the agreements will be the responsibility of the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

A standard written agreement for reciprocal borrowing has been written and circulated to all academic libraries under the auspices of the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries.

Background (Recommendation I and II)

Academic libraries in Colorado have generally supported total access to information for both the academic and non-academic community within the limitations of the libraries' resources. Furthermore, academic libraries have participated in a number of projects to improve access. For example:

1. State-supported institutions have loaned directly to students of other State-supported colleges.

2. Members of Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries have directly loaned to students in other member libraries, including a private university and a large, comprehensive public library.

3. All State-supported academic institutions are members of Regional Library Service Systems which provide cooperative interlibrary services to all types of libraries within a designated geographic area. Some system programs involve direct access.

4. Many libraries have developed cooperative agreements with a limited number of other academic, public, school, or special libraries, generally within a local geographical area.

5. Most of the academic libraries are also participating in the development of the Colorado Union Catalog which includes the holdings of libraries of all types.

6. Most academic libraries are involved in one or more State, regional, and/or national computerized bibliographic networking systems. This permits a wide variety of access points for users.

Statewide access is essential to satisfy users' requests for information. However, reciprocal borrowing to provide that access necessitates consideration of additional facts, including the following:

1. Each library must have a basic collection and cannot expect other libraries to compensate for a weak base collection.

2. Frequently, a user's limited time is further reduced when information is not available on campus.

3. There are additional costs for a library in providing document delivery to outside users.

ACCESS (con't)

The private academic libraries in the State have unique problems in providing direct access, as they are under no obligation to serve people who are not members of their faculty and student body. This situation must be addressed by any policy on access. Also, resolution #7 of the Colorado Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services recommends that the law "be revised to allow full and equal participation of privately supported libraries in Regional Library Service Systems."

III. Recommendation: Community Information Needs

A first-phase study will be made of how academic libraries can assist in satisfying the information needs of their general and business communities without impairing service to their faculty and students. The Colorado Academic Library Committee will initiate a study to identify the magnitude of problems and strategies for addressing the needs.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The study was completed in 1983 and is on file with the Colorado Academic Library Committee and the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries (CCAL).

Background

Access has become a critical issue of the 1980's and been established as the first priority of the American Library Association.

In Colorado, research needs of business, community, and unrelated academic groups are placing demands on academic libraries which are not funded to provide resources for these groups. A study should be conducted to determine actual and potential types of users, range of required resources and services, positive and negative effects on services to students, and other pertinent factors. It should address both ways and means to support present service levels as well as how such services may be extended. This study will then provide a basis for planning and documenting the additional costs of providing access to all citizens of Colorado.

LIBRARY SERVICES

- The instruction in the use of libraries, information resources, and educational technology, as well as guidance in research methodology and data base searching provided by libraries to faculty, students, and the general public.

I. Recommendation: Library Instruction Programs

The Colorado Council of Academic Libraries, in cooperation with the Colorado Library Association's Library Instruction Round Table, will organize a task force to identify and, as necessary, develop models and guidelines for fully developed programs of library instruction. These programs will be made available on a Statewide basis.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The Colorado Library Association's Library Instruction Round Table has established a forum for the discussion of bibliographic instruction. A regular feature of Colorado Libraries is "BI Line," a Column on Bibliographic Instruction which serves to disseminate information concerning instruction models.

Background

Traditionally academic libraries have been perceived as units which collect, organize, and disseminate information. While instruction in the use of library resources is not a new phenomenon, a more dynamic role is required. As the development of library instruction programs requires much time, new staffing patterns should be developed and the cooperative development of these programs among similar institutions should be explored. Such instruction must become an intrinsic part of library services and include appropriate planning. (See Appendix D for the Association of College and Research Libraries' Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction.)

The recently formed Colorado Library Association's Library Instruction Roundtable has taken the initial step in coordinating instruction in the use of all types of libraries. Its plan to serve as a clearinghouse for information on such activities and to produce a directory of instructional programs with contact people should provide a foundation in this area. However, academic libraries must go beyond this point. Instruction in the use of libraries must be identified as an essential service by library administrators. Furthermore, librarians should identify instructional models produced nationally which could be used in Colorado; new instructional models should be developed only if they cannot be found elsewhere. Such models should be utilized and/or modified as appropriate to the unique needs of each institution.

LIBRARY SERVICES (con't)

II. Recommendation: Statewide Conference on Academic Libraries

In order to explore the potential role of academic libraries in promoting quality education, the Colorado Academic Library Committee in cooperation with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education will sponsor a conference in the Fall of 1983 on "Integrating Libraries Into the Educational Mainstream", which will bring together teams of three (one librarian, one classroom faculty member, and one academic officer at the vice president or dean level) from each participating institution. Furthermore, the proceedings and recommendations of this conference will be distributed throughout the State.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library sponsored through the Colorado Academic Library Committee a conference entitled A Colorado Response to the Information Society: The Changing Academic Library. The Conference, held in Denver on October 6 and 7, 1983, was attended by representatives of almost all Colorado institutions of higher education. Proceedings were recorded. It should be noted that a mini-conference using the same format was held at Western State College for consortium colleges. There are other similar conferences planned for 1985/86.

Background

As new demands confront higher education, corresponding challenges confront academic libraries calling for critical self-evaluation and careful planning to support and promote the learning and research goals of their parent institutions.

Unfortunately, in many cases libraries are overlooked in their traditional roles as the resources base for the curriculum much less being thought of as contributing to the solution of more recent higher education concerns, such as the diversity in students' academic abilities; increasing emphasis on individualized instruction; rapid change including obsolescence of knowledge; and the increasing potential and use of technology in education. A major educational program should be developed to inform students, faculty, administrators, legislators, and the general public of what academic libraries currently offer and what they could offer to support established educational priorities of the State.

Better public awareness will provide support for positive library efforts and impetus for those who are reluctant to respond to new challenges. The educational activity required to effect such a change should occur at the State level.

NETWORKING

- The structures required for cooperative acquisitions, and automated cataloging and interlibrary loan services.

I. Recommendation: CARL Online Projects

The online catalog developed by the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries should be implemented promptly for access by other state/national institutions with support and financial backing as appropriate from individual institutions, governing boards, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and the State Department of Education.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

Since Spring of 1984 the CARL online catalog has been available for dial-up by other institutions.

Background

Budgets for library materials to support the individual institutions' missions are not adequate to keep up with inflation or the information explosion, therefore, the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries has promoted the concept of cooperative acquisitions. To implement this concept the member libraries must know the holdings in all other members' collections; the online catalog is the best solution. Also, since the national system of cataloging changed early in 1981, making the new catalog cards are incompatible with existing card catalog records. The cost of making existing cataiogs compatible with the new cataloging is prohibitive, and an online system is therefore a timely solution.

The online catalog operating cost will be significantly less than maintaining the existing card catalogs and making them compatible with new cataloging rules.

II. Recommendation: CARL Online Catalog

Since the CARL online catalog is operational, a plan including costing, joining, and organizational options which will allow other academic libraries to come online has been developed. This plan is being widely distributed, discussed thoroughly, and modified as needed so that other libraries may participate in the online catalog.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

A plan has been developed to alow other libraries to become part of the CARL system.

Background

In addition to being cost effective, the online catalog provides more efficient use of the combined holdings of the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries which represent 46% of the books and 90% of the unique titles held by Colorado libraries. The basic plan is to create a computer file of the bibliographic records of each of the members' holdings and to develop software which will enable and encourage sophisticated searching of the file. Simplified cataloging elements will be presented, making identification of relevant material easier and improving the use of the collection. Approximately 400 terminals will eventually be placed in member libraries for direct user access, replacing the traditional card catalog with all its limitations. Users will be able to access instantly the combined collections of all the members, i.e., those portions of the collection in machine readable format (see Access Recommendation III).

Once the online catalog is fully operational it should be made available to other libraries in the State. Thus, access to the collections of the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries could be provided to all Colorado citizens. Also, the quantity and titles of materials available will increase when other institutions add their holdings to the data base.

ADMINISTRATION

- The coordination and development of library services and resources.

I. Recommendation: Staff Development Programs

A plan for a continuous staff development program responsive to the needs of all types of academic library personnel will be developed by the College and University Division of the Colorado Library Association (CLA). By Spring of 1983 this plan will be submitted to the CLA Executive Board for review prior to implementation by CLA.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The College and University Division of the Colorado Library Association has completed a plan for a continuous staff development program and has established a committee to implement the program.

Background

As society becomes increasingly dependent on the access and use of information, there will be growing need for library staffs to be knowledgeable about information needs, means of information transfer, and the latest technologies for the management of information resources. In addition, repeated staff development analyses across the country have documented the need for training in managerial and supervisory skills to ensure competent delivery of library services. Continuing education programs for all types of library personnel must address these concerns to ensure libraries' ability to meet society's evolving information needs.

It is important to recognize, plan, and promote strong continuing education programs that transcend the resources of individual libraries. This can be accomplished best by the College and University Division of the Colorado Library Association working in conjunction with the State Library's Continuing Education Consultant. Strong library administrative support will be required to ensure adequately implementing the plan once it is developed.

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE

- The means by which the Master Plan can be effectively implemented and updated.

I. Recommendation: Academic Representation to CCLD

A change in procedure will be actively sought so that academic representation on the Colorado Council for Library Development (CCLD) will be selected by the State Board of Education from nominees for each position recommended by the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries and forwarded to the Board of CCLD.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The Colorado Council for Library Development accepts nominations from the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries (CCAL) for the Academic representation on the Council and marks the names of such nominees on the list submitted to the State Board of Education.

Background

As the library directors for all public and private academic libraries are members of the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries, this group is respresentative and, therefore, most appropriate to recommend nominees for the academic appointments to the Colorado Council for Library Development.

II. Recommendation: Colorado Academic Library Committee

The Colorado Academic Library Committee will continue to identify and analyze problems of general concern to academic libraries, calling attention to the same and suggesting solutions as appropriate.

ACCOMPLISHMENT:

A Colorado Academic Library Committee has been established. The Committee meets each Spring and Fall to review the Plan and monitor its implementation. The Committee is also available to answer concerns raised by various state agencies including CCHE and the State Library.

Background

As it is important that this Master Plan be a viable and current document, the Colorado Academic Library Committee will

1. initiate actions necessary to implement the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan.

2. review the progress of the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan and update it on a continuing basis.

3. report on the progress, updating, and implementation of the Master Plan to the academic community as well as for subsequent updatings of the appropriate sections of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library's master plans.

4. provide advice relating to academic libraries, as appropriate, to public and private institutions, governing boards, the Association of Public College and University Presidents, Colorado Association of Community/Junior College Presidents, Colorado Board of Education, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and other State agencies.

This Committee will be based on the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan Committee. Members will serve for three-year overlapping terms; Colorado Council of Academic Libraries will fill vacancies by appointment, preserving the representative nature of the Committee. Representation will include a

1. community college librarian.

2. Western Slope librarian.

3. four-year college librarian.

4. non-state supported librarian.

5. specialized academic librarian.

6. research librarian.

7. representative of the Colorado Alliance of Research libraries (to be appointed by CARL).

8. representative of Colorado Council of Academic Libraries.

9. staff support member for Colorado Commission on Higher Education (to be appointed by CCHE).

In addition, there will continue to be non-voting representation from the two statuatory bodies: the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library as well as the Association of Public College and University Presidents.

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH BACKGROUND STATEMENTS

1984

ACCESS

- The means of identifying, locating, cataloging, delivering, and receiving information.

I. Recommendation: Written Policy on User Access

A written policy on user access should be developed immediately by those academic libraries in the State which had not as of February 21, 1985. The policy should be based upon the access policy guidelines developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries. (See Appendix A). Each statement is (or will be) on file at the State Library, and is (or will be) available to the entire library community. Each institution should rewrite its policy statement every five (5) years.

II. Recommendation: Reciprocal Borrowing Agreement

The CCAL will monitor the level of participation in compliance with the reciprocal borrowing agreement. (See Appendix B).

Background (Recommendation I and II)

Academic libraries in Colorado have generally supported total access to information for both the academic and non-academic community within the limitations of the libraries' resources. Furthermore, academic libraries have participated in a number of projects to improve access. For example:

1. State-supported institutions have loaned directly to students of other State-supported colleges.

2. Members of Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries have directly loaned to students in other member libraries, including a private university and a large, comprehensive public library.

3. Most State-supported academic institutions are members of Regional Library Service Systems which provide cooperative interlibrary services to all types of libraries within a designated geographic area. Some system programs involve direct access.

4. Many libraries have developed cooperative agreements with a limited number of other academic, public, school, or special libraries, generally within a local geographical area.

5. Most of the academic libraries are also participating in the development of the Colorado Union Catalog which includes the holdings of libraries of all types.

6. Most academic libraries are involved in one or more State, regional, and/or national computerized bibliographic networking systems. This permits a wide variety of access points for users.

Statewide access is essential to satisfy users' requests for information. However, reciprocal borrowing to provide that access necessitates consideration of additional facts, including the following:

1. Each library must have a basic collection and cannot expect other libraries to compensate for a weak base collection.

2. A user's frequently limited time is further reduced when information is not available on campus.

3. There are additional costs for a library in providing document delivery to outside users.

The private academic libraries in the State have unique problems in providing direct access, as they are under no obligation to serve people who are not members of their faculty and student body. This situation must be addressed by any policy on access. Also, resolution #7 of the Colorado Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services recommends that the law "be revised to allow full and equal participation of privately supported libraries in Regional Library Service Systems."

III. Recommendation: Retrospective Conversion

To assure access to in-depth information in each HEGIS area, bibliographic data on the strongest collections in the State in each subject area will be converted to machine readable form following adopted standards for format and content as funds are available. Retrospective conversion is taking place in most libraries based on campus needs. (The Colorado State Library lends terminals for retrospective conversion projects.)

Background

The availability of automated cataloging, periodical holdings, and interlibrary loan services in Colorado libraries has provided new channels of access and promoted resource sharing. These systems are available in all but one of the four-year college and university libraries, in many of the community college libraries in the State, and for those not owning terminals, through the Regional Library Service Systems' offices. The major problem in providing access to the resources in the State is the need to convert the records for libraries' collections acquired before the installation

of the automated systems. For the larger libraries this is a task beyond the capabilities of existing staffs. However, automation is the best method by which libraries can access information in other libraries' collections.

Retrospective conversion of records in at least a selective manner must be a high priority for the next decade.

IV. Recommendation: Resource and Service Compensation Comprehensive Plan

Because of the quality of their collections or because of their being a major library in their Regional Library Service System, some libraries provide services to other libraries in the State and must be compensated accordingly. The Colorado State Library (CSL), with adequate input from academic libraries, will provide leadership in developing a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective. In the interim, full funding of allocations made through CSL for net interlibrary loans of materials is a desirable objective.

Background

In the Fall of 1981, the funding problems of the Denver Public Library focused attention on the costs of library services. Eventually someone must pay for library resources and services whether the cost be borne by a local government agency, the State, or an individual. How funding is provided, however, has a great deal to do in fostering Statewide resource sharing.

If an academic library's services to its faculty and students are not to be diluted, then an equitable method of funding its services to other libraries must be provided. Moreover, it is not reasonable to expect those institutions and governing boards, which have made adequate provisions for their campuses, to assume wider responsibilities for the State without their libraries' being adequately compensated so that on-campus services are protected. Unless an equitable funding method can be developed, the goal of viewing academic libraries as related parts of a whole with each providing access to the resources of all will not be reached.

The Colorado State Library (CSL) is currently reviewing existing compensation policy, and it is hoped that a plan, which adequately encompasses the needs of academic libraries, will be completed during 1985. (Attention must be given to interlibrary reference services as well as to resource sharing.) Such a plan should receive widespread support from higher education. In the meantime, the CSL net lending program should be strengthened. Various studies document that responding to an interlibrary loan request costs $2.00 to $12.00 depending upon the cost factors included (e.g., whether such costs as overhead costs and staff time are included). The four dollar figure, currently accepted within the State as the cost of an interlibrary loan transaction, was selected by the State Library as being an equitable yet conservative figure.

However, the Colorado General Assembly has not adequately funded the program and payments have been prorated. Concerted efforts by the Colorado State Library, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, and the governing boards should be directed at full funding of this program.

Finally, it should be recognized that, while Statewide demands for interlibrary services fall particularly heavily on the large research libraries, the same problem also exists for those academic libraries which are the largest libraries in their Regional Library Service Systems, because under interlibrary loan protocols libraries must seek materials within their system before going elsewhere in the State. Thus, the University of Southern Colorado Library, which is one of the chief resources for the Arkansas Valley System, during 1980/81 loaned 197 items to school libraries and 283 items to public libraries. Similar situations exist for other academic libraries such as Western State College, Fort Lewis, Mesa, and Adams State.

V. Recommendation: Online Data Bases

All academic libraries should provide their faculty and students with access to online data bases. Ways should be sought to reduce economic barriers to such access.

Background

With almost 1,000 online data bases available nationally, computer assisted information retrieval is increasing in Colorado. While not all indexes are available online, in many cases it eliminates the need to spend hours searching through printed indexes and offers more sources from which to obtain information than printed indexes. With the exponential increase of new serial titles, only the online data bases are able to accommodate the corresponding growth of subject indexing. Also, many data bases have no printed version. The most advantageous aspect of computer searching, however, is the boolean logic capability which enables identification of only those articles which mention all of the specified subjects. This is a major breakthrough for researchers who have been previously confined to a single subject approach with printed indexes.

Because computer assisted research is growing in most academic libraries, a Statewide study of its impact on related services should be conducted, funding alternatives other than fees to users should be explored, and plans for cooperative training of staff and/or sharing expertise and access should be developed.

VI. Recommendation: Information Resources Location

A single place on each campus to identify the locations of all information resources (print and non-print) should be provided through the library in order to promote quality learning and research.

Background

Studies show that the single most important factor in the use of information is ease of access. This situation is intensified as conflicting demands increase the pressures on time available for both students and faculty.

The role of libraries as information brokers, connecting users with information regardless of its location or format, will become more important in the future. It will be essential for libraries to cooperate with other departments in their institutions so that information about the location of all campus information resources is available in the library.

VII. Recommendation: Non-print Material Utilization

A task force, established under the auspices of the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries, shall develop a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of non-print materials with particular emphasis on identifying needed cooperative activities. This plan will be submitted by Spring, 1985, for review and possible implementation by the Colorado Academic Library Committee. This will be done in cooperation with the Regional Library Service Systems.

Background

Some libraries have developed basic collections of non-print materials while most others are just beginning to collect them. Therefore, planning for effective use of these resources is essential and must include such topics as cooperative purchasing, resource sharing, and delivery systems. To make cooperative purchasing and resource sharing more feasible, union lists of libraries' holdings are needed. The Video Clearinghouse project developed under an LSCA grant by the Boulder Public Library has attempted to provide a union list of video programs available in Colorado libraries and other institutions; a similar service is needed for other formats.

After necessary Statewide guidelines have been developed, individual institutions should develop policies for non-print materials relevant to Recommendations I and II.

VIII. Recommendation: Delivery System

A communications and document delivery system connecting all academic libraries in Colorado must be a long-term objective. As an immediate objective, the State Library will encourage the appropriate Regional Library Service Systems to extend the present courier network south to Pueblo as soon as possible.

Background

Interlibrary loan activity has been increasing at a steady rate. For example, from 1978 to 1980, Southwest Library System activity has increased 170%; High Plains, 50%, and Arkansas Valley, 40%.

Document delivery is now accomplished by mail or courier. Central Colorado, High Plains, and Plains and Peaks Library Systems provide courier service, connecting and interconnecting 150 libraries. During a one year period 934,482 interlibrary loan transactions were completed by and among these systems' couriers. Funding for the courier service varies but is provided by system funding and participating libraries' fees. At the present time, no courier service exists for the Arkansas Valley System or the three Western Slope Systems.

A major problem in information access for students and faculty is document delivery. Possible alternatives include extension of the courier service, telefacsimile transmission, and electronic mail. For the short term, an extension of courier service south to Pueblo is the most feasible. Courier service for the Western Slope does not appear to be cost effective at the present time.

For the long term, since libraries of the future will emphasize disseminating information rather than books, it will be necessary to develop communication and delivery systems which are fast, cost effective, and efficient. As telefacsimile transmission of data or electronic mail may offer solutions, developments in these areas should be carefully monitored by all libraries in the state.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

- The selection, acquisition and preservation of library materials.

I. Recommendation: Written Collection Development Policy

Each academic library in the State should, in cooperation with faculty and administration, produce a written collection development policy at the earliest possible date, but no later than 1985. Each policy statement will be on file at the State Library, be available to the entire library community, and be reviewed periodically by the respective institutions. These policies should all follow a common format. This will permit comparisons of data as well as other kinds of analysis. (As an example CARL Libraries use a common format that is based on an ACRL format.) This recommendation must be accomplished before Recommendation II.

Background

Recently collection development has received renewed importance in library management. Contributing factors include:

1. the price inflation of printed materials which consistently exceeds the general inflation rate.

2. the exponential growth of information.

3. the decrease in funds available, because both private and public funding agencies are shifting their priorities away from higher education.

4. the increasing availability of computer technologies, permitting sophisticated and efficient assistance in collection management.

Therefore, collection development policies should be written. These policy statements should include the specific mission of the institution as well as an awareness that the basic needs of each academic institution ordinarily must be met by its own library, not through borrowing from other libraries. It is not the intention of resource sharing to permit an academic library, which does not meet the basic needs of its primary constituency, to overcome this inadequacy by relying upon the resources of other libraries.

As a minimum, policies should include these elements:

1. Criteria for the selection, evaluation, and weeding of all print and non-print collections.

2. Collection development guidelines that will:

   a. meet instructional and classroom needs by providing an adequate range of separate titles to meet course requirements and sufficient duplication of titles in high demand.

b. meet basic needs of student and faculty research required by the degree programs of the institution.

The format for the statements should follow the American Library Association Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies. (See Appendix C.)

Developing policies based on these guidelines is a complex task, necessitating careful and detailed work which will be an assignment in addition to the regular workload for those involved in collection development. The target date for completion of this recommendation is, therefore, set for 1985.

II. Recommendation: Standard Collection Development Policy

1. A Committee should be established to develop a standard format for Statewide collection development policies.

2. A workshop should be held in the Spring of 1985 sponsored by the State Library to give representatives from academic libraries a working knowledge of how to implement collection development policies. Experienced collection development experts from the State should be used as resource persons. Formats may be different for two-year and four-year colleges and universities.

III. Recommendation: Cooperative Acquisitions

In order to extend the benefits of cooperative acquisitions as experienced by Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries, CARL's Colorado Organization for Library Acquisitions with appropriate Statewide representation from non-members will develop a model for cooperative acquisitions on either a State or in-State regional basis. This activity will begin as soon as collection development policies in a standard format are established at a significant number of academic libraries. It should be recognized that geographic proximity of various groups of cooperating libraries is important to the success of cooperative acquisitions and cooperative sharing.

Background

Because of the expanding information base and declining budgets, cooperative collection development must be addressed on a Statewide basis. In consultation with the Resource Consultant at the Colorado State Library, a cooperative acquisitions program should be developed including the assignment of primary collection responsibilities to individual institutions. These assignments are currently recognized by the Statewide Acquisitions Formula. A prime example of a successful cooperative acquisitions program is the Colorado Organization for Library Acquisitions. Member libraries have agreed to contribute a percentage of their individual acquisitions budgets to form a cooperative acquisitions fund to purchase expensive research items, where one copy would satisfy Colorado's needs.

However, it is important to recognize the costs of such cooperation: coordinating purchases of materials requires an additional expenditure of time from all involved, time is lost for students and faculty while material is obtained from a distance, and absence of materials from the home library may cause problems there. Also, this type of cooperation cannot substitute for basic collections required at each institution.

As both public and private institutions' libraries share the problem, they must cooperate in arriving at the solution.

- The instruction in the use of libraries, information resources, and educational technology, as well as guidance in research methodology and data base searching provided by libraries to faculty, students, and the general public.

I. Recommendation: Library and Information Retrieval Competency

All graduates from institutions of higher learning in Colorado should acquire competency in the use of libraries and information resources, including modern methods of technological information retrieval. At the institutional, governing board, and State levels, the requirement for students to become competent in information handling/research capabilities should be officially endorsed. On campuses where competency requirements exist in areas such as reading, computer literacy, writing, and math, library and research related competencies also should be expected as one of the basic literacy skills. As part of their learning experience, students should gain an awareness of the literature of their fields and how to access, evaluate, and manipulate it so that they are prepared to continue learning after graduation.

II. Recommendation: Library Materials Adequacy

The adequacy of library materials and other information resources as well as instruction in their use should be addressed by individual institutions and governing boards in any guidelines for evaluating their academic programs.

Background

Given the exponential growth of information and the complexities of the means by which information can be accessed, America is rapidly becoming an information rich but knowledge poor society. Instruction in the effective utilization of information within disciplines is critical to both academic research and to the ability of graduates to keep abreast with developments in their fields. Moreover, information handling skills are essential in the development of alert and critical minds.

Official recognition of the importance of instruction in the use of Libraries in higher education is shown by the HEGIS survey which now requests statistics on group transactions and the total number of persons participating in them. However, while most people agree that academic programs must have adequate library resources to support them, traditionally little attention has been given to instruction in the use of these resources.

III. Recommendation: Cooperative Program Development

Library directors should encourage cooperative program development for instruction in the use of libraries among groups of libraries with similar clientele, and should encourage the adaption and implementation of such programs in keeping with the unique needs of their individual institutions.

IV. Recommendation: Curriculum/Classroom Faculty Development

As a follow up to the State Conference on A Colorado Response to the Information Society: The Changing Academic Library, the Colorado Academic Library Committee in cooperation with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education will facilitate the formation of a task force made up of a representative group of classroom faculty, librarians, and media specialists to develop a series of models for promoting curriculum/classroom faculty development. The report on these models will be widely distributed in the State for use as desired by individual campuses.

Background

As new demands confront higher education, corresponding challenges confront academic libraries calling for critical self-evaluation and careful planning to support and promote the learning and research goals of their parent institutions.

Unfortunately, in many cases libraries are overlooked in their traditional roles as the resource base for the curriculum rather than being thought of as contributing to the solution of more recent higher education concerns, such as the diversity in students' academic abilities; increasing emphasis on individualized instruction; rapid change including obsolenscence of knowledge; and the increasing potential and use of technology in education. A major educational program should be developed to inform students, faculty, administrators, legislators, and the general public of what academic libraries currently offer and what they could offer to support established educational priorities of the State.

Better public awareness will provide support for positive library efforts and impetus for those who are reluctant to respond to new challenges. The educational activity required to effect such a change should occur at the State level.

V. Recommendation: Educational, Computer, and Video Technology

Statewide activities on educational, computer, and video technology should specifically address the role of academic libraries, as appropriate, in relation to the future of such technology in higher education. To accomplish this the Colorado Academic Library Committee will keep informed of such activities and seek appropriate representation.

VI. Recommendation: Educational Technology Use

Libraries should cooperate and actively seek involvement in campus activities directed at use of educational technology for instruction both on and off campus.

Background

The need for lifelong and individualized learning opportunities has been documented in educational literature. Self-paced learning materials, available in a variety of formats, to a small extent, have made these ideals a reality. However, limited software, lack of access, and the traditional reluctance to change mean that the impact on higher education has not yet been realized fully, particularly in the four-year institutions. Telecommunications advances and the ability to individualize media will change this situtation.

Therefore, it is appropriate in this plan to recommend exploration of how technology, especially telecommunications, can benefit library services and assist libraries in contributing to quality education and research in the State.

NETWORKING

- The structures required for cooperative acquisitions, and automated cataloging and interlibrary loan services.

I. Recommendation: Bibliographic Utilities

All academic libraries not presently taking advantage of a bibliographic utility should, at the earliest date, begin participation with the Online Computer Libraries Center (OCLC) system or another national bibliographic utility which allows interfacing with OCLC.

Background

The development of computerized networking systems has had a substantial impact upon resources and demands for access to information. The majority of public and private academic libraries in Colorado now participate in one of the national bibliographic systems. As of September 4, 1984, the libraries listed in Appendix F belonged to OCLC. This offers a variety of access points for library users, both directly and through interlibrary loan. Also, it permits the libraries using the same system to develop cooperative computerized projects.

An academic library's lack of participation in a computerized networking system reduces that library's service to its faculty and students and prevents the library from effectively interfacing with other academic libraries on Statewide cooperative computer projects. Those institutions unable to support stand alone systems should explore cooperative arrangements with other institutions.

II. Recommendation: Automation and Networking Projects Funding

In order to secure funding for developmental and major capital purchases for automation and networking projects which are consistent with the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan and which go beyond what can be funded by an individual governing board, the Colorado Academic Library Committee will, with the approval of the institutional governing boards, facilitate cooperative efforts among the governing boards, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and the Colorado State Library in obtaining funding from all appropriate sources.

Background

The securing of funding outside of institutional budget structures will facilitate participation of all Colorado Academic Libraries in automation and networking activities. Total participation is essential to the futures of the individual libraries and to a Colorado library network which will make the total information resources of the State available to all Colorado citizens.

III. Recommendation: Bibliographic Record Format Standards

National standards for bibliographic record format and content should be adhered to in future networking efforts in Colorado in order to permit the interfacing of networking activities in the State and on a national basis.

Background

Acceptance of national bibliographic standards for record format and content are necessary to permit the interfacing of library networks in Colorado and the nation; this, in turn, will allow better user access to information. For all practical purposes, this currently means a MARC format as adopted by the American National Standards Institute Committee Z-39, which is concerned with fundamental standards for the library and information sciences, and as endorsed by the State Board of Education LSCA committee in the Spring of 1981.

- The coordination and development of library services and resources.

I. Recommendation: Acquisitions Funding Formula

Publicly supported academic institutions and their governing boards should be supportive of the existing framework for acquisitions budget planning as provided in the Association of Public College and University Presidents' acquisitions funding formula. In addition, special provision must be made for retrospective purchasing when new degree programs are approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education or when new certificate programs are approved by the State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education. The formula should also serve as a valuable guideline for private institutions.

Background

The Association of Public College and University Presidents appointed a subcommittee in 1976 to devise a formula to determine budget requests for library materials. Subsequently, each institution's existing holdings in the subject areas specified by the Higher Educational General Information Survey (HEGIS) were determined. Then a formula was developed which took into consideration the strengths of the collections in the subject areas, the programs of the institutions, unit costs of materials, and the number of books published annually in the HEGIS subject areas. The formula has been reviewed annually, is equitable and provides for continued development of collections.

Two problems exist, however. First, the Legislature has funded this formula at only 55% or less each year. The impossibility of this situation in terms of adequate support for instruction and research can be seen if one thinks in terms of what would happen if the faculty formula had been funded at the 55% level. At such a reduced funding level, the integrity of the formula is destroyed, preventing the libraries from even maintaining the quality of the collections previously developed. Also funding for materials for new programs, requiring the purchasing of basic materials, was not a part of the formula and has not been considered by the Legislature or institutions in initiating such programs; special funding provisions for library materials to support new programs must be made.

The State's departure from formulas to more flexibility in budgeting for governing boards adds a new dimension to the problem. The assumption that basic collection adequacy and equitable support across the State have been achieved is erroneous in the case of the acquisitions formula where funding has been at such a low level. Unless a more reasonable funding level is achieved throughout the State and unless the current cooperative mechanism for acquisitions budget planning or some adequate substitute continues, the overall resource base for Colorado may be seriously eroded and some institutions may come to depend on the resources of other campuses rather than adequately providing support for their own academic programs.

II. Recommendation: Funded Organized Research

Guidelines developed by individual institutions for funded organized research should include assessment of and provision for required library resources and services including research funding for interlibrary loan and data base searching expenses.

Background

When individual institutions are involved in funded organized research, libraries need to be included in the planning stages. Research often requires library resources and services such as databased searching and interlibrary loan. Frequently library staffs are not consulted regarding the impact of research on collection or services which are needed primarily for support of classroom activities. It is essential that libraries be included in institutional research planning.

III. Recommendation: Library Staffing Guideline

An equitable academic library staffing guideline is needed. One is currently being developed by the Association of Public College and University Presidents' Formula Financing Library Subcommittee and should be completed as quickly as possible.

Background

Certainly realistic guidelines for staffing levels are advisable for use by governing boards and individual institutions whether publicly or privately supported. All public academic librarians are keenly aware of the problems resulting from the Association of Public College and University Presidents' Library Staffing Formula. The formula itself has limitations. Also, the Joint Budget Committee staff has funded only parts of it and frequently modified those parts. Such inconsistent funding makes planning extremely difficult, and sometimes impossible.

The Staffing Task Force of the Association of Public College and University Presidents' Formula Financing Library Subcommittee is analyzing staffing guidelines, including those used in other states. Although there is merit in developing new guidelines based on a full study of the time required to perform library operations, such a study is a lengthy process which could result in conclusions similar to those reached by other states. Therefore, the task force is attempting to modify one of the existing guidelines to meet Colorado's needs. Revised guidelines should provide for:

1. staffing for media production.
2. staffing for community use.
3. staffing related to acquisitions levels.
4. staffing for library instruction.
5. possible staffing allocation considering enrollment averages for a period of years.

IV. Recommendation:

The CALC, in cooperation with the CCHE, shall develop revised library space planning guidelines by Spring 1986. The proposed guidelines are in Appendix G.

Background

Existing 1973 CCHE Guidelines do not adequately reflect important changes in library space needs given the continuing information explosion, the dramatic changes in library technology, especially networking, and new functions of libraries in supporting emerging higher education programs.

- The means of which the master plan can be effectively implemented and updated.

To plan effectively for future development and to coordinate progress, academic libraries' relationships with appropriate State agencies and groups need to be formalized. To accomplish this the following actions will be taken:

I. Recommendation: Campus Master Plans

Each institution should include library goals and objectives in its campus master plan. These should contribute to and be reflective of the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan.

Background

In the current institutional master plans, the role of the library within the campus is stated in very general terms or not at all. The role should be reexamined considering the library as a part of the total educational process, not as a separate entity. Such things as the information explosion, technological advances, individualized learning processes, increasing adult learning, and the diversity in students' academic abilities make it essential to define the role of the library within the educational mission of the institution. Therefore, goals and objectives for the library should be written into each campus master plan to provide direction for library planning and a basis for accountability.

As of March 1984 the following institutions included libraries in their master plans: Iliff, Western State, University of Northern Colorado, Loretto Heights, University of Southern Colorado, and the Community Colleges.

II. Recommendation: Incorporation of CALMP

Incorporation of the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan (CALMP) into the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library master plans will be actively sought. Endorsement and adoption, as appropriate, of CALMP by academic governing boards, the Association of Public College and University Presidents, and the Colorado Association of Community/Junior College Presidents will be actively sought.

Background

An academic library master plan is of value in direct proportion to how much it is used as a guide for planning on a Statewide and individual campus basis. Incorporation of the academic library master plan into the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library master plans is essential to provide broad direction at the State level and to facilitate cooperative activities necessary to making available all the library resources of the State to all Colorado citizens.

However, Statewide cooperation and progress cannot be achieved unless there is also support at the local level. If there is institutional and governing board commitment to the need for a quality library information base for learning and research in the State plus endorsement of a plan to promote the same, then progress can be made. For this reason, official endorsement of organizations such as the Association of Public College and University Presidents and the Colorado Association of Community/Junior College Presidents as well as that of the academic governing boards is of prime importance.

As the plan is revised and updated, CCHE, the Colorado State Library and individual boards will be informed.

III. Recommendation: Colorado Academic Library Committee

The Colorado Academic Library Committee will continue to identify and analyze problems of general concern to academic libraries, call attention to these problems, and suggest solutions as appropriate.

Background

As it is important that this Master Plan be a viable and current document, the Colorado Library Committee will:

1. initiate actions necessary to implement the Colorado Academic Library Master Plan.

2. review the progress of the Colorado Academic Master Plan and update it on a continuing basis.

3. report on the progress, updating, and implementation of the Master Plan to the academic community as well as for subsequent updatings of the appropriate sections of the Colorado Commission of Higher Education and the Colorado State Library's master plans.

4. provide advice relating to academic libraries, as appropriate, to public and private institutions, governing boards, the Association of Public College and University Presidents, Colorado Association of Community/Junior College Presidents, Colorado Board of Education, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and other State agencies.

Members of the CALC serve three-year overlapping terms. Representation shall include a:

1. community college librarian.
2. Western Slope librarian.
3. four year college librarian.
4. non-state supported librarian.
5. specialized academic librarian.
6. research librarian.
7. representative of the Colorado Alliance of Research libraries (to be appointed by CARL).
8. representative of Colorado Council of Academic Libraries (elected by CCAL).
9. staff support member for Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

In addition, there will continue to be non-voting representation from the two statuatory bodies: The Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado State Library.

APPENDIX A

ACCESS POLICY GUIDELINES*

Approved as policy by the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries, July 3, 1975.

Introduction

The committee has developed the following guidelines to assist academic libraries, whether public or private, urban or rural, in codifying their policies with respect to access by persons other than their respective primary clientele. The guidelines are intended to deal primarily with on-site access, but they may be used as the basis to cover other means of community access such as written and telecommunications inquiries.

The goal of total access to information is a major concern of librarians as articulated by the ALA Goal and Objectives statement, the first objective of which is as follows:

> Provision of library and information services and resources for all the people of the United States of America in order to increase their opportunity to participate in society, to learn to achieve self-fulfillment, to pursue careers, and to obtain information needed for research.

In addition, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has stated in its report, Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action,

> ... the total library and information resource in the United States is a national resource which should be developed, strengthened, organized, and made available to the maximum degree possible in the public interest. This national resource represents the cumulated and growing record of much of our nation's, and indeed, much of the world's, total cultural experience-intellectual, social, technological and spiritual.

While these two statements do not necessarily imply on-site access, or the other forms discussed, many academic libraries are mindful of the need to articulate clearly their policies relating to collections and services.

*olicy Guidelines," Association of College and Research Libraries
rican Library Association, Volume 36, Number 10, Nov. '75, pp.
3

Institutional goals and circumstances are highly variable, making it both unworkable and undesirable to be prescriptive in approaching the question of community access to library collections and services. Public and private academic libraries have an obligation to examine their particular institutional goals as well as specific educational and legal responsibilities preparatory to articulating a policy on community access. The purpose of sharing library resources consistent with such a policy is to ensure that appropriate use if made of all collections and services. The reader must be assisted in terms of where to go first for material and what steps are necessary to obtain the information on material needed.

For the purposes of this document, "community" is considered to include those individuals outside the library's primary clientele who may have occasion to make personal use of its collections and/or services.

Frequently libraries within the community have developed cooperative use agreements on the basis of the types of material collected and general, consequent strengths associated with the respective libraries. This development provides a reasonable basis for instructing a variety of users in the appropriateness of using various collections.

Whether or not formal cooperative agreements exist, librarians are obligated to be well-informed about the policies and resources of other libraries in the area in order to make appropriate referrals. All libraries, regardless of size or prestige, have something to contribute to total information resources, and informal cooperation can help to alleviate the problems associated with community access to academic libraries.

It is recommended that the policy statement be made available to all users in an attractive format.

Outline

Consideration of the following outline may be helpful in arriving at and stating on access policy.

1.0 PURPOSE OF LIBRARY

2.0 COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Location of library - urban, rural.

2.2 Source of library funding, public, private.

2.3 Strength of library collections.

2.4 Number of persons constituting primary clientele.

2.5 Space/seats available for users.

2.6 Service personnel available by function location, day and time.

2.7 Administrative services-where policy inquiries are to be directed.

2.8 Legal obligations and restrictions.

3.0 COMMUNITY FACTORS

3.1 Other libraries in the community.

3.1.1 Location.

3.1.2 Size.

3.1.3 Nature of collections.

3.1.4 Services.

3.1.5 Clientele.

3.1.6 Regulations for use.

3.1.7 Networking and cooperative arrangements.

3.2 Social and political factors.

4.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL USERS AND USE

4.1 Size of groups.

4.2 Age and educational level.

4.3 Nature and purpose of use.

4.4 Types of material to be used.

4.5 Hours of use.

4.6 Services required.

4.6.1 Informational and directional assistance.

4.6.2 Reference assistance.

4.6.3 Borrowing: registration, notices, billing, etc.

4.6.4 AV systems and equipment use.

4.6.5 Copying service.

4.6.6 Use of meeting space, display space.

4.6.7 Interlibrary loan.

4.6.8 Special fee-based services.

NOTE: Specific institutional policy statements should incorporate relevant factors from the foregoing outline. It is not intended that the outline itself prescribe the form and character of the resulting policy statement.

Sample Outline
For a Policy Statement

1. Definition of library purpose.

Statements of mission and goals immediately establish the basis for public expectations. For example, if users not immediately associated with the particular institution are told they do not constitute part of the primary clientele, they have modified expectations. This statement ought to be presented in positive language, briefly stating the nature of the library mission.

An example of such language follows:

The library constitutes a vital instructional and research arm of the University of _____ and exists primarily to contribute to the university's teaching and research functions. In addition, the library seeks to serve the citizens of the State of _____, consistent with its primary function and within the limits of its resources.

If liberal access and service are the norm, this can be reflected is the mission statement. A statement of how the library fits into a general plan of library services among libraries in the state or other organized service groups might also be included, if available.

2. Basis for community service.

2.1 Definition of community.

2.2 Categories of eligible users.

3. Specification of identification and types of access.

3.1 I.D. cards, or introductory letters from home institutions, consortia cards, or cooperative library cards, etc., required.

3.2 Non-fee access.

3.3 Fee access.

3.3.1 Identification of fee categories and amounts.

3.3.2 Basis of valid fee period (i.e., semester, quarter, fiscal or calendar year, etc.).

3.3.3 Payment details (when and where)

4. Services.

4.1 Circulation regulations.

4.1.1 Identification required of user.

4.1.2 Loan periods if applicable (specify general use materials not subject to loan and loan periods by type if applicable).

4.1.3 Access to special collections or library branches if not covered above.

4.1.4 Special distinctions among nonaffiliated users if applicable (e.g., students from other colleges, schools, teachers, other professionals).

4.1.5 Sanctions (including fines and replacement of lost or damaged material).

4.2 Security measures - exit control.

4.3 Information services.

4.3.1 Description of available services by broad subject or type (e.g., humanities, documents, archives, maps, etc.) and location.

4.3.2 Basis of access (in-person, phone, letter, etc.).

4.3.3 Hours of service (noting special limitations for community users).

4.4 Other services.

4.4.1 Reproduction services and costs.

4.4.2 AV equipment and personnel available.

4.4.3 Conference rooms/auditoriums (availability and process for reserving).

4.4.5 Special fee-based services (e.g., access to computerized bibliographic data bases).

References

1. American Library Association. "Goal and Objectives of the American Library Association" as adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, January 24, 1975.

2. U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, "Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action" (Washington, D.C.: 1975) p.x.

APPENDIX B

RECIPROCAL BORROWING AGREEMENT

In order to provide greater and more convenient access to resources for the members of their institutions, the Colorado Council of Academic Libraries as indicated by the signatures on the attached sheet, hereby enter into an agreement to extend reciprocal library borrowing privileges to students, faculty and staff of each participating institution on July 1, 1984.

Borrowers will identify themselves by presenting current and valid identification cards as issued by their respective institutions. Upon presentation of such identification the bearer shall be permitted the use of materials from the host library under the rules and conditions which prevail at that library. Should a borrower incur fines or charges for the loss or damage of borrowed materials, the borrower is responsible for payment of those charges to the lending institution. Should a borrower fail to make prompt payment of the charges, the home institution agrees to assess the payment to the borrower in a manner appropriate to the home institution.

In July 1984, and annually thereafter as long as this agreement is in effect, the participating libraries agree to pay any unpaid assessments for lost or damaged materials incurred by their patrons. It is expected that the majority of such charges will have been paid by the responsible borrower, but in the event the collection of such charges proves unsuccessful the two concerned libraries will settle the accounts in the interest of good interinstitutional relations. The individual institution may, of course, continue their efforts to collect the payments due from individual borrowers enrolled with or employed by them.

Copies of the lending policies of each library are attached to this letter of agreement. Each library will assume responsibility for notification to members of its institution concerning the terms and conditions of this agreement. Any library may withdraw from this agreement effective July 1 of a given year providing written notice is given to other participants a month in advance.

Each library agrees to provide to the others, upon request, the latest known address and telephone number of a student, faculty, or staff person for purposes of mailing or telephoning overdue or recall notices.

Each library will send overdue, recall, and billing statements directly to borrowers regardless of institutional affiliation. After two notices, the lending library will notify the home library of the delinquent borrower in writing of unreturned items and charges to be collected for payment to the lending library.

APPENDIX C

"GUIDELINES FOR THE FORMULATION OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICIES"*

2.2 Elements of a collection development policy statement.

2.2.1 Analysis of general institutional objectives including:

1. Clientele to be served.

2. General subject boundaries of the collection.

3. Kinds of programs or user needs supported (research, Instructional, recreational, general information, reference, etc.).

4. General priorities and limitations governing selection, including:

   a. Degree of continuing support for strong collections.

   b. Forms of material collected or excluded.

   c. Languages, geographical areas collected or excluded.

   d. Chronological periods collected or excluded.

   e. Other exclusions.

   f. Duplication of materials (generally treated; but see also 2.1.1., Note, which states: The collection development policy statement addresses the question of breadth and depth of subject coverage. Libraries will need to formulate separate statements of policy relating to duplication of materials; and such additional policy statements must be given consideration in fund allocation.).

5. Regional, national or local cooperative collection agreements which complement or otherwise affect the institution's policy.

2.2.2 Detailed analysis of collection development policy for subject fields. The basic arrangement of this analysis is by classification; a parenthetical subject term follows the class number for ease of interpretation. A suggested minimum of

*"Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies," Library Resources and Technical Services, American Library Association, Volume 21, No. 1, Winter, 1977, pp. 44-45.

refinement of the Library of Congress classification on which to structure the analysis is the breakdown into approximately 500 subdivisions used in Titles Classified by the Library of Congress Classification: Seventeen University Libraries. Preliminary ed. Berkeley, General Library, University of California, 1973. (A list of the classes used in that survey is appended to these guidelines.) For Dewey or other classifications, a comparably refined breakdown should be attempted.

Note: This recommendation indicates a minimal refinement of classification analysis needed to permit inter-institutional comparisons. Many libraries will prefer to analyze their collections in greater detail.

For each subject category (i.e., classification number or group of numbers), indicate the following:

1. Level of collecting intensity codes to indicate:
   a. Existing strength of collection.
   b. Actual current level of collection activity.
   c. Desirable level of collecting to meet program needs.
2. Language code or codes.
3. Chronological periods collected.
4. Geographical areas collected.
5. Forms of material collected (or excluded).
6. Library unit or selector with primary selection responsibility for the field.

2.2.3 Detailed analysis of collection development policy for form collections.

In some libraries special collection development policy statements are required for certain forms of materials, where policy governing the collection of those materials differs from the library's general policy for subject collections. Some examples of forms for which special policy statements may be needed include:

1. Newspapers
2. Microform collections
3. Manuscripts

4. Government publications

5. Maps

6. Audio-visual materials

7. Data tapes

Where possible, it is desirable that the basic structure of the policy statement for a form collection follow subject classification; but with some form collections it will be necessary to use another primary arrangement (kind of material, area, etc). For example, the policy statement for a map collection might be divided first into "general maps," "topographic maps," "thematic maps," "raised relief maps," etc., with sub-division by area classification; that for a newspaper collection might be primarily by political division.

Whatever the basic structure chosen, the detailed analysis of collection development for a form collection should include the elements identified in 2.2.2 (1)-(6) above.

2.2.4 Indexes

The information in the policy statement should be made accessible for a wide variety of purposes. To this end an index should be appended which correlates subject terms to class numbers. Individual libraries may also wish to index by academic programs, library units, or other key words or concepts.

APPENDIX D

GUIDELINES FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES*

The college and university library performs a unique and indispensable function in the educational process. It bears the central responsibility for developing the college and university library collections; for extending bibliographic control over these collections; for instructing students formally and informally; and for advising faculty and scholars in the use of these collections.

In order to assist college and university libraries in the planning and evaluation of effective programs to instruct members of the academic community in the identification and use of information resources, the identification and use of information resources, the following guidelines for bibliographic instruction in academic libraries are suggested:

1. Access the needs of its academic community for orientation to the library's facilities and services, and for instruction in the use of the library's collections and bibliographic structure.

2. Prepare a written profile of the community's information needs.

3. Develop a written statement of objectives of bibliographic instruction which:

   a. Includes immediate and long range goals with projected timetables for implementation.

   b. Is directed to specific identified needs within the academic community, and permits various methods of instruction for all segments of the academic community who have a need to use library resources and services.

   c. Outlines methods by which progress toward the attainment of instructional objectives can be measured. Methodology must provide for measures of learning.

4. Provide continuing financial support for bibliographic instruction:

   a. Clearly identifiable within the library's budget program and statements.

   b. Sufficient to provide the professional and supportive staff, equipment, materials and facilities necessary to attain the delineated objectives.

*Reprinted from the April 1977 issue of College & Research Libraries News, a publication of the Association of College and Research Libraries.

5. Employ librarians and other qualified staff to plan, implement and evaluate the program.

   a. Inclusive of persons with training in: various academic disciplines, the identification and use of library resources, teaching skills, preparation and use of audiovisual and other instructional materials, preparation and use of evaluative instruments, clerical skills.

   b. Insufficient numbers necessary to attain the delineated objectives.

   c. Clearly identifiable and of a status similar to persons responsible for planning, implementing and evaluating the other major functions of the library.

6. Provide facilities, equipment and materials.

   a. To accommodate the preparation of instructional materials and the presentation of various modes of instruction (individual, small or large group, lecture, discussion, media, etc.).

   b. Of sufficient size, number and scope to accommodate the attainment of the delineated objectives.

7. Involve the academic community in the formulation of objectives and the evaluation of their attainment.

8. Evaluate regularly the effectiveness of the instructional program, and demonstrate substantial attainment of written objectives.

APPENDIX E

DELETED RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Recommendation: Periodicals Union List

A Colorado union list of periodicals' titles and holdings, based on an acceptable data base service will be developed. Current efforts to obtain Library Services and Construction Act funding for this purpose should be continued.

New Background

This recommendation is no longer being considered as the Committee feels the Union list is not cost effective at this time.

II. Recommendation: On-line Cooperative Activities

A task force will be established under the auspices of the Rocky Mountain Online Users Group to identify problems and develop guidelines for cooperative activities related to online data base searching. A task force report will be submitted by January, 1983, to the Colorado Academic Library Committee for review and implementation.

New Background

On-line cooperative activities are being carried out by the Bibliographic Center of Research and the seven Regional Library Service Systems.

APPENDIX F

BCR/OCLC PARTICIPANTS

Type of Library	# of Term	Code	Colorado
Special	2	BDR	Bibliographical Center for Research, Denver
School	1	BOA	Boulder Valley Public Schools, Boulder
Special Denver	1	CBS	Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary,
Special Durango	2	CDA	Southwest Regional Library Service System,
Special	(D)	CJM	Manville Service Corporation, Denver
Special	1	CLF	Colorado Union Catalog
Academic	4	COA	University of Colorado--Denver (Auraria)
Public	3	COB	Aurora Public Library, Aurora
Academic	2	COC	Colorado College, Colorado Springs
Academic	7	COD	University of Colorado--Boulder
Academic	1	COE	Pikes Peak Community College, Colorado Springs
Academic	1	COF	Colorado State University, Fort Collins
Public	2	COG	Three Rivers Library System, New Castle
Special	1	COI	Illiff School of Theology, Denver
Academic	1	COL	Loretto Heights College, Denver
Academic	1	COM	Mesa College, Grand Junction
Academic	3	COP	Colorado School of Mines, Golden
School	4	COQ	Southeast Metropolitan Board of Cooperative Services (SEMBCS), Denver
Academic	1	COR	Regis College, Denver
Academic	1	COS	University of Southern Colorado, Pueblo
Special	1	COU	University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver

Type of Library	# of Term	Code	Colorado (continued)
Academic	6	COV	University of Northern Colorado, Greeley
Academic	1	COW	Western State College, Gunnison
Academic	2	COX	University of Colorado--Colorado Springs
Special	(S)	COY	Denver Law Librarians, Denver
Special	1	COZ	Colorado State Library, Denver
Public	1	DAD	Douglas County Public Library, Castle Rock
Special	(D)	DNS	Swedish Medical Center, Medical Library, Englewood
Special	(S)	DDB	Colorado State Publications Depository and Distribution Center, Denver
Special	(D)	DGS	University of Denver, Graduate School of Librarianship and Information Management, Denver
Public	2	DMP	Mesa County Public Library, Grand Junction
Public	7	DPL	Denver Public Library, Denver
School	1	DVA	Adams County School District #12, Denver
Special	(D)	DVI	Information Management Specialists, Denver
Special	1	DVJ	Colorado Supreme Court Library, Denver
Academic	1	DVN	Front Range Community College Library, CCD Systems, Westminster
Academic	5	DVP	University of Denver, Denver
Academic	1	DVR	Red Rocks Community College Library, DDC Systems, Golden
Special	(S)	DVS	Denver Special Librarians, Denver
Academic	1	DVZ	Arapahoe Community College Library, Littleton
Special	(D)	USO	United States Olympic Committee, Colorado Springs
School	2	DAJ	Jefferson County School District R-1, Lakewood
Special	(S)	DVX	Denver Area Project, Denver

BCR/OCLC PARTICIPANTS

Type of Library	# of Term	Code	Colorado (continuted)
Special	(S)	DVL	Library Services, Denver
Special	(S)	CIH	Colorado Center for Educational Assistance ELPA, Englewood
Special	(D)	DVH	Porter Memorial Hospital Medical Library, Denver
Public	1	CQA	Pueblo Library District, Pueblo
Academic	1	CDF	Fort Lewis College, Durango
Special	(S)	CQE	Parkview Episcopal Hospital, Medical Library, Pueblo
Special	(S)	CQS	Saint Mary Corwin Hospital, Medical Library, Pueblo
Special	(S)	CQH	Colorado State Hospital, Professional Library, Pueblo
Special	(D)	DNR	Regional Transportation District, Records & Information Center, Denver
Special	(S)	DNE	Mountain States Employers Council, Denver
Special	(S)	DNG	Medical Group Management Association, Denver
Special	(S)	DNF	Association of Operating Room Nurses (AORN), Denver
Special	(S)	DNN	Denver Museum of Natural History, Denver
Special	(S)	DND	Lutheran Medical Center, Wheat Ridge
Special	(S)	DNB	National Jewish Hospital, Medical Library, Denver
Special	(S)	DNL	Cobe Laboratories Library, Lakewood
Special	(S)	DNJ	Saint Joseph Hospital Library, Denver
Special	(S)	DNM	Mercy Medical Center Library, Denver
Special	(S)	DNA	Denver Art Museum, Denver
Public	(1)	CNL	Longmont Public Library, Longmont
Academic	(S)	CQB	Pueblo Community College Library, Pueblo
Special	(S)	DNH	Colorado Historical Scoiety Library, Denver
Academic	(S)	CQD	Pueblo School District #60, Pueblo
Special	(D)	DNC	Gates Corp., Technical Information Center, Denver

APPENDIX G

LIBRARY AND MEDIA CENTER SPACE GUIDELINES

LIBRARY SPACE

This category includes space used for the collection, storage, and circulation of books, periodicals, microforms, manuscripts, and other reading and reference materials as well as offices and service areas used by library staff. Guidelines have been developed for purposes of determining assignable space needs for (a) stacks including volume equivalents, (b) readers, and (c) service, as well as (d) collection size.

STACKS

0.10 ASF per volume for first 300,000 volumes, then 0.08 ASF per volume for larger collections.

0.025 ASF or as appropriate for system selected for compact shelving.

Archives should have at least 500 linear feet of 12" or 15" adjustable shelves.

Volume equivalents for non-book materials are:

Microfilm	3 reels = 1 volume
Microfiche/Microprint	8 cards = 1 volume
Recording/Videodiscs	5 items = 1 volume
Pamphlets	8 pieces = 1 volume
Videocassettes	1 cassette = 1 volume
Films	1 reel = 1 volume
Maps	8 maps = 1 volume

Other non-book items should be estimated using the guideline for the type material they most closely resemble.

READERS

6.25 ASF per FTE student station, 7.50 ASF per "wet" carrel (25 ASF per regular station, 30 ASF per "wet" station). Seating shall be provided for 25 per cent of FTE students in two-year colleges. Research study stations for temporary assignment to visiting scholars using library materials shall be 48 ASF. No provision is allowed for faculty study stations as such, although institutions may allocate some reader space to faculty study stations if they wish to do so. Readerspace in archives and special collection areas shall be 30 ASF per station.

SERVICE (INCLUDING SPACE FOR LIBRARY STAFF)

25% of stack and reader space

VOLUMES (COLLECTION SIZE)

Criteria for determining the number of volumes for four-year colleges and universities are as follows:

a.	Basic opening day collection	85,000 volumes
b.	Allowance per FTE Faculty Member	100 volumes
c.	Allowance per FTE Student	15 volumes
d.	Allowance per Masters Field when NO Doctorate is offered in Field:	6,000 volumes
e.	Allowance per Masters Field when Doctorate IS offered in Field:	3,000 volumes
f.	Allowance per Doctoral Field	25,000 volumes
g.	Allowance per Undergraduate Major or Minor Field	350 volumes
h.	Allowance per Sixth Year Specialist Degree Field	6,000 volumes

Criteria for determining the number of volumes for two-year colleges as follows:

a.	Basic Collection	28,000 Units
b.	Allowance per FTE Faculty	50 Units
c.	Allowance per FTE Student	5 Units
d.	Allowance per Subject Field of Study (i.e., number of academic departments, programs)	165 Units

Both sets of criteria above assume that when minimum collection levels are met, an annual growth rate of five percent should be a minimum level of acquisition. Anticipated deletions should not exceed three percent annually.

PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

SECTION A. Evaluation Perspectives and Considerations from CCHE

SECTION B. Methodology

SECTION C. Summary of Planning Standards

SECTION D. Stack Space

SECTION E. Volume Equivalents

SECTION F. Reader Space

SECTION G. Service Space

SECTION H. Collection Size Criteria

SECTION I. Other Space

SECTION J. Library Media Center Space Planning Criteria

SECTION K. Library Building Program Requirements

SECTION A

EVALUATION PERSPECTIVES

Assumption-1. Academic library services are fundamental to the teaching, research, and public service mission of each college and university. Policy planning for institutional mission, and services planning for academic support, should "drive" both the facilities space planning procedures and criteria.

Assumption-2. Architectural design criteria for library layouts are "activity measurements" suitable for the architectural design phase, but which do not represent space utilization criteria for State-level evaluation of programmatic space, nor are they useful as State-level decision-making criteria for approval of library facility program plans. Such design layout criteria are available to architects in standard reference publications.

Assumption-3. The current CCHE Library Facility Planning Guidelines are incomplete in scope, with respect to space planning criteria for Special Collections and Archives, Federal Document Depository, Educational Media Services. The amended Guidelines should be complete in scope of academic support functions.

Assumption-4. Standards for libraries, as published by ALA and the association of College and Research Libraries, are indexed to peer-groups, and are fairly generous in space and collection size standards. CCHE amended planning criteria needed to be acceptable to the entire Colorado constituency, including legislators. Amended guidelines should provide measures of the intensity of space use that would be acceptable. Intensity meansures are in turn determined by type of institution, levels of instruction, type of student (resident, off-campus, adult), and community needs of geographical area.

QUESTIONS

1. Are the current CCHE library facility program planning procedures and space criteria appropriate, necessary, and sufficient for State-level review and approval of space allocations for academic library facility requirements?

2. Are the current guidelines relevant and responsive to the range of academic support programs that should be located in a learning resources center?

SECTION A (con't)

3. Are the space planning criteria realistic in relationship to the information management technologies and information "marketing" changes that will impact academic libraries in the next 20 years?

4. Are the space planning assumptions for the utilization of reader stations relevant to the different utilization requirements of commuter campuses and resident campuses?

5. Are the "formula assumptions" for the amount of program resources used in the staffing budget and used in the space program planning mutually consistent?

6. What space planning criteria are appropriate for Special Collectives and Archives, Federal Document Depository, and for specific Educational Media Production, Instruction, and Service functions?

7. What performance aspects of a written library collection development policy should be evaluated at the State-level to assure that utilization of collections and maturity of collections are appropriately translated into stacks requirements?

8. Are the current collection-size criteria appropriate for basic library holdings, for faculty, for student, and for undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral programs? Should different collection-size criteria be authorized depending on the relative maturity of the institution?

9. Should faculty FTE, by level of instructional program, be addressed in the collection-size formula for library stacks?

It is obvious that a number of these questions will have to come before the entire Colorado Academic Library Committee, and this communication is being sent to the co-chairs of that Committee. Your advice and suggestions are requested only in your areas of expertise, but it is important to present the total context in which policy guidelines must be reviewed and revised.

SECTION B

METHODOLOGY

The initial step in the review of the Guidelines was a literature review for existing standards from appropriate agencies. The most recent standards from national bodies are:

1. "Standards for College Libraries" approved July 3, 1975, by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

2. "Standards for University Libraries" approved October 26, 1978, by the Association of Research Libraries and January, 1979, by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

3. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (Revised)," approved June 30, 1981, by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

4. "College and University Archives Guidelines" approved September 28, 1979, by the Society of American Archivists.

5. "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs" 1979, the Community and Junior College Libraries Section, American Library Association.

6. "Evaluative Checklist for Reviewing a College Library Program" 1979, based on the 1975 "Standards for College Libraries," developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

Requests were made to a number of state boards and planning agencies throughout the country for copies of their latest guidelines and/or standards. Responses from agencies included the states of California, Florida, Kansas, New York, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. These responses also included in their data, information from Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and South Dakota, plus planning elements from some specific universities and colleges. Standards from Canada and Great Britain were also studied in the review. The recommendations incorporate the most recent planning guidelines as adopted with consideration for existing and future technologies.

SECTION C

SUMMARY OF PLANNING STANDARDS

	READER SPACE ASV/FTES	STACK SPACE ASF/VOLUME	SERVICE SPACE ASF
California (1971) (1974)	6.25 6.90	0.10 0.10	140 ASF per staff plus 400 ASF
Delaware	5.0	0.10	140 ASF/Staff
Florida (1984)	5.0 Minimum 6.25 Normal 7.5 Maximum	0.08 Minimum 0.11 Normal 0.14 Maximum	
Illinois	7.5	0.07 to 0.10	25% of "Study"
Indiana	3.5	0.10	32% of "Study"
Kansas (1984)	7.5+ 10% Faculty FTE at 75 NASF each	0.087	Processing - 10% of Reader and Stacks plus 125 ASF/FTE staff + 30 ASF/FTE staff
Missouri	8.33	0.0667	25%
Montana	5.0 Lower 7.0 Upper 9.0 Grad	0.10	Not Specified
New York (1972)	6.25	0.10 first 150,000 0.09 next 150,000 0.08 next 300,000	25%
Ohio (1974)	7.5-25% seated 6.0-20% seated-2 year	0.09 0.10	20%* 20%**
Oklahoma	5.0 Lower 6.25 Upper 7.50 Grad	0.0667	25%
South Carolina	6.25	0.083	20%
South Dakota	5.0	3.0 FTES	Not Specified
Texas (1971)	6.25 5.0-2 Year	0.10 0.10	140/staff plus 400 ASF

SECTION C (con't)

	READER SPACE ASF/FTES	STACK SPACE ASF/VOLUME	SERVICE SPACE ASF
Virginia (1982)	6.25/Undergrad 8.75/Grad/Faculty	0.0833	25%*
Wisconsin (1984)	6.25 15% Faculty at 50 ASF	0.10 first/150,000 0.09 next 150,000 0.08 next 300,000 0.07 over 600,000	25%*
ACRL (1975)	5.0 Non-residential 6.25 Residential 8.33 Strong Lib Arts	0.10 first 150,000 0.09 next 150,000 0.08 next 300,000 0.07 above 600,000	25%*

* % is of total of "Stacks" plus "Reader" space.

** AV is 1.5 ASF per 2-year student.

SECTION D

STACK SPACE

The 1973 Colorado guidelines provide for 0.0833 ASF per volume, or one ASF for each 12 volumes.

The "Standard for College Libraries," 1975 (5) recommend the book space as:

	Square Feet/Volume
First 150,000 volumes	0.10
Next 150,000 volumes	0.09
Next 150,000 volumes	0.08
Holdings over 600,000 volumes	0.07

The sixteen states showed New York and Illinois using this same standard. Six states used the 0.10 ratio, six used lower ratios with the lowest 0.0667 square feet per volume, one exceeded with a ratio of 0.11 ASF/Volume (Florida) as normal, and South Dakota used a ratio of 3.0 ASF per Full Time Equivalent Student. Keyes Metcalf (46) based his recommendation on the type of institution and size of collection. His ratios are:

10 volumes/ASF for undergraduate collections to 50,000 volumes

12 volumes/ASF for larger undergraduate collections to 100,000 volumes

13 volumes/ASF for larger collections

15 volumes/ASF for universities with research collections, and stack access for faculty and graduate students up to 20 volumes/ASF for great research library, limited stack access, narrow aisles, and long ranges.

10 Volumes/ASF	=	0.10 ASF/Volume
12 Volumes/ASF	=	0.833 ASF/Volume
13 Volumes/ASF	=	0.0769 ASF/Volume
15 Volumes/ASF	=	0.0667 ASF/Volume
20 Volumes/ASF	=	0.050 ASF/Volume

The introduction of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (U.S. Department of Labor) standards into building planning consideration will have an unknown impact on future library plans. The "Minimum Guidelines and Requirements for Accessible Design" in 1982 reserves Subpart E for development of requirements for special elements such as library stacks. The standard in Subpart D calls for wheelchair clear width passage of 3'0" as a minimum for other design planning. OSHA Safety Standards must be met.

Based on the requirements of libraries to house resources in a wider variety of media and the other space impact influences it is recommended that the GUIDELINE planning factor be 0.10 ASF per volume for the first 300,000 volumes, then 0.08 ASF per volume for larger collections. For compact shelving, ratios should be based on the specific system proposed. Ratios may be as low as 0.025 ASF per volume. Space projections should take into account the effects of growth rates at varying levels:

4% net growth doubles a collection in about 17 years

5% net growth doubles in about 14 years

6% net growth doubles in about 12 years

For archives and special collections, individually justified planning ratios will be determined based on the nature of the materials to be housed such as document boxes, rare books, photographs, maps and blueprints, correspondence, and other items.

A minimum of five hundred linear feet of shelving for archives was recommended by the Society of American Archivists (1) in 1979. Shelves should be 12" on 15" adjustable shelves for storage of document boxes.

No allocation is authorized for collections which do not require special handling because of value of the materials or format.

SECTION E

VOLUME EQUIVALENTS

The question of volume equivalents for counting non-book materials is sometimes asked. There is not a single conversion guideline used throughout the materials reviewed, with most not referring to a method of counting at all.

WICHE uses the general formulas of:

Microfilm -3.2 boxes = 1 book volume
Microfiche/print -8 cards = 1 book volume
Recordings/Videodisks -4 = 1 book volume
Pamphlets -8 pamphlets = 1 book volume

The Ohio Standards use:

Pamphlets/documents -8 pamphlets = 1 book volume
Microfilm reels -3 reels = 1 book volume
Recordings -8 recordings = 1 book volume
Maps -8 maps = 1 book volume

The Virginia Standard calls for:

Government documents -15 items = 1 volume
Manuscript materials -175 pieces = 1 volume

It is recommended that state GUIDELINES for space planning use the volume equivalents as follows:

Microfilm	3 reels = 1 volume
Microfiche/Microprint	8 cards = 1 volume
Recordings/Videodisks	5 items = 1 volume
Pamphlets	8 pieces = 1 volume
Videocassettes	1 cassette = 1 volume
Films	1 reel = 1 volume
Maps	4.5 maps = 1 volume

Other non-book items should be estimated using the guidelines for the type material they most closely resemble.

SECTION F

READER SPACE

The Colorado guidelines for 1973 call for 6.25 ASF per FTE student at universities, 5 ASF per FTE student at other institutions, with seating for 25 percent of the student body, and specific figures for differing seating uses.

The 16 state standards provide stations of 20, 25, 30 ASF/FTE student with the 25 ASF being the most common, and 30 ASF or higher for about the same number of states. Where faculty seating areas are specifically addressed, they range from 35 ASF to 75 ASF. The 1975 ACRL Standard (5) assumes 25 ASF for each patron seat without specifying type of patron or use. None of the standards here speak to the introduction of significant planning requirements for "wet" carrels for use of machines - microform readers, video cassette players, computer terminals, audio listening, video listening/viewing, slide viewing, and similar equipment. Analysis of the types of "wet" carrels snows their primary need to be access to electrical power and possibly cable systems. The equipment "add-on" to individual patron space is generally only 2-3 ASF per station.

It is recommended that the GUIDELINE be a station size of 25 ASF per regular patron space, 30.0 ASF per "wet" patron space. Seating shall be provided for 25 percent of FTE students in universities and four-year colleges, and 20 percent of FTE students in two-year colleges. Research study stations of 48 ASF will be authorized for temporary assignment for use of visiting scholars using library materials. No provision shall be allowed for faculty study stations as such, although institutions may allocate some reader space to faculty study stations if they wish to do so. Reader space in archives and special collections areas should be 30 ASF per station.

SECTION G

SERVICE SPACE

This is to include area for administrative offices, conference rooms, acquisition and processing areas, positions for public services and other staff areas, plus areas for card catalogues and staff-operated electrical equipment.

The Colorado 1973 guidelines called for 23 percent of the first 40,000 ASF of stacks and reader space, and 19 percent above 40,000 ASF.

Two of the sixteen states do not specify how service space was assigned. The allocation of 25 percent or higher was used by seven states, and four used a formula of 140 ASF per FTE staff, three with an additional 400 ASF or better added on. The ACRL 1975 standards (5) call for 25% of stacks and reader space.

The most significant change in recent years is the introduction of computer systems including public access catalogs throughout libraries, and especially in technical service and reference areas. Many new, integrated on-line computer systems in libraries will find the main frame hardware installed in the library. While these and other prospective new technologies may replace some traditional library functions, it is necessary that space planning recognize their impact on future buildings.

At the ACRL Conference in Seattle, April 6, 1984, Mr. David C. Weber, Librarian of Stanford University, spoke on "The Impact of Computer Technology on Academic Library Buildings." He is preparing a revision of Metcalf's book for 1985 publication. He predicts many small changes in buildings, but few radical needs. Processing locations will change, some staff will require a regular work station plus one separate from a terminal location, stations slightly larger. In private conversation later I asked about changes in allocation formulas for 1985 edition, he felt no significant change was likely other than adding one for compact shelving.

Based on these considerations, it is recommended that the GUIDELINE be increased to 25 percent of the total stack and reader space for all types of libraries.

SECTION H

COLLECTION SIZE CRITERIA

The guidelines in the 1973 State standards are those of the 1965 Clapp-Jordan formula (22). Following the issuance of this formula, a number of criticisms arose, and most recent formulas now closely approximate the 1975 "Standards for College Libraries" (5) and those adopted in 1970 for the State of Washington (35) which are frequently quoted in other state guidelines.

The criteria to determine minimum quantitative adequacy of college and university library resources are:

	1970	1975
	Washington	College (ACRL)
Basic Opening Day Collection	85,000 units Library Resources	85,000 volumes
Allowance per FTE Faculty	100 units	100 volumes
Allowance per FTE Student	15 units	15 volumes
Allowance per Masters Field When NO Doctorate is offered in Field	6,100 units	6,000 volumes
Allowance per Masters Field When Doctorate IS offered in Field	3,050 units	3,000 volumes
Allowance per Doctoral Field	24,500 units	25,000 volumes
Allowance per Undergraduate Major or Minor Field		350 volumes
Allowance per Sixth Year Specialist Degree Field		6,000 volumes

Both formulas assume that when minimum collection levels are met, an annual growth rate of five percent should be a minimum level of acquisition. Anticipated deletions should be at a level not to exceed three percent annually.

The "Standards for University Libraries" (6) state that no formula has been devised which can be generally applied, existing ones offering only approximations which indicate a general level of need. One possible technique is the use of regression analysis to facilitate comparision of similar libraries with one another.

It is recommended that the State of Colorado GUIDELINE adopt the ACRL 1975 standard (5) based on the nationwide character of the Association, the diversity of institutions represented in the framers, and the likelihood of continued review for possible revision by the ACRL.

The community college standard in Colorado for collection size in 1973 was that recommended by Clapp-Jordan for liminal adequacy for junior or community college libraries.

The New York State standards for 1972 adopted a modified Clapp-Jordan formula with an increase in the size of basic collections proportional to the increase adopted in the State of Washington for colleges, and a provision for annual growth and deletions as included in the State of Washington study. The formula thus calls for the following quantities:

	Units
Basic collection, general education or liberal arts program support	28,000
FTE Faculty	50
FTE Student	5
Subject field of study (i.e., number of academic departments, programs, etc.)	165

A minimum number of acquisitions each year equal to five percent of resource units held at the beginning of the year is expected. Deletions should not exceed three percent per year.

The California Community Colleges in 1974 adopted a print guideline for numbers of volumes:

Initial increment	16,000 volumes
Additional increments	
Under 3,000 Day-Graded Enrollment	= 8 volumes per DGS*
3,000-9,000 DGE	= 7 volumes per DGS
Above 9,000 DGE	= 6 volumes per DGS

*DGS - Day-Graded Student. California used the ratio that FTE x 0.6 = DGS

Ohio uses a planning ratio of twenty volumes per FTE Student for two-year colleges.

The criteria for two-year programs are listed in the 1979 "Statement of Quantitative Standards..." (2).

SECTION H (con't)

FTE Enrollment Level*		Written Materials: Periodical Subscription	Written Materials: Other written	Recorded Materials: Motion Pictures videotape	Recorded Materials: Other Recorded	Other Materials	Collection Size Total
Under 1,000	M	200	20,000	15	350	50	20,615
	G	300	30,000	125	1,350	350	32,125
1,000-3,000	M	300	30,000	125	1,350	350	32,125
	G	500	50,000	350	3,200	1,200	55,250
3,000-5,000	M	500	50,000	350	3,200	1,200	55,250
	G	700	70,000	700	5,350	2,350	79,100
5,000-7,000	M	700	70,000	700	5,350	2,350	79,100
	G	800	85,000	1,250	8,500	4,500	100,000
Additional Each 1,000 over 7,000	M	5	6,000	13	10	5	6,133
	G	30	12,000	150	405	305	12,890

* M-Minimal
G-Good

It is recommended that the New York State quantitative formula be adopted as the GUIDELINE, with the understanding that individual two-year college programs be assessed additionally in their role of involvement in learning resource center activities on specific campuses.

OTHER SPACE

The 1975 "Standards for College Libraries" specify space for readers, books, and administration. They then recognize that "In the absence of consensus among librarians and other educators as to the range of non-book services which it is appropriate for libraries to offer, no generally applicable formulas have been developed for calculating space for them. Thus, space required for a college library's non-book services and materials must be added..."

The few state and other plans which mention centers for learning resources other than books show no uniformity in approach. WICHE cites the State of New York criteria ranging from 8,100 to 38,320 ASF.

2 year colleges	8,100 to 11,000 ASF
Arts and Science colleges	12,200 to 23,000 ASF
University Centers	29,920 to 38,320 ASF

California 1975 (40) criteria specify 5,000 ASF for up to 1,000 Day-Graded Students (DGS), with additional footage for increments to be added.

1,000-3,000 DGS add 1.5 ASF per DGS

3,000-5,000 DGS add 1.0 ASF per DGS

6,000-9,000 DGS add 0.5 ASF per DGS

over 9,000 DGS add 0.25 ASF per DGS

Florida provides a range for a variety of audio-visual functions with allocations for each type of minimum, normal, and maximum. Kansas provides for audio-visual services 1.2 ASF per 3 FTE students plus office and production space of 180 ASF per staff member, with 1.5 staff members per 1,000 FTE students. Ohio allows 1.5 ASF per FTE student in two-year learning resource centers.

There is no correlation in terms of amounts of audio-visual facilities required and their organization within individual institutions. It is recommended, therefore, that where such facilities are to be provided, the individual institution must develop the program to be supported, and provide the specific guideline against which they have planned their space needs. The only general consistency is that at least 5,000 ASF be provided, with stations 30 ASF or higher as specific uses require.

SECTION J

LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER SPACE PLANNING CRITERIA

The primary difficulty in attempting to establish space planning criteria for media centers within Higher Education libraries, is the almost total lack of uniformity in form and definition. While centralized media centers are common, not all institutions place them within the library framework. Even within libraries, the "media" or "learning resource" center is often little more than a reserve area for non-print materials, and has little or no relationship to the institution's central area for storage and delivery of equipment and materials, creation of materials, electronic maintenance services, and cable TV distribution, etc.

For that reason, no criteria can be universally applied to all institutions. Space needs are totally dependent upon the individual institution's decisions regarding the types and levels of services to be provided.

As certain types of services, however, will normally require certain types of spaces, this report will attempt only to identify those space types which are needed in order to provide various media support functions. The actual amount of space needed in each type must be adjusted individually according to the volume of equipment, materials, and personnel to be accommodated.

Media Center Functions and Space Types

I. Acquisition/Distribution Function - the acquisition and scheduled distribution of materials and equipment.

Level A. Maintenance of a film/software materials collection with adjacent on-site work areas requires:

--Materials storage space. Similar to library stack space. Temperature and humidity are important factors in storage space.

--Listening/viewing station area. Individual carrel or small group use area containing audio-visual playback or computer terminal equipment.

--Materials maintenance area. Work space for cleaning inspecting, and repair of materials. Particularly important for 16mm film collections.

Level B. Expansion of above to include general campus and/or public distribution requires:

--Additional space for storage of circulating delivery equipment. May be within the center or in various substations.

--Additional space for clerical and equipment scheduling personnel.

--If distribution of materials is by electronic means (low power or cable TV, radio, etc.), spaces similar to those specified in Production Services will be required.

II. Engineering and Maintenance Function - the electronic, electrical, and mechanical support of media center equipment and systems.

Level B. Routine repair and maintenance of all equipment used within the context of media center operations requires:

--Work space modification to accommodate drafting tables and design facilities.

--Conference area for planning and design.

III. Production Function - the creation and/or duplication of original materials. This function is the most complex and varied due to the wide range of materials which an institution may elect to produce. For this reason "types" of production are described.

Type A. Production and duplication of audio taped materials requires:

--Soundproof area for voice recording.

--Adjacent work space to house audio mixing equipment, tape recorders, turntables, and amplifiers.

--Work space to house tape editing and duplication equipment plus moderate storage (shelf) space for tape and cassette storage.

Type B. Production and duplication of graphic arts materials requires:

--Work space to house drawing tables, lettering equipment, transparency processing equipment, and materials storage. Large graphic production areas may require space for computers or computer terminals.

Type C. Production and duplication of photographic materials requires:

--Work space for photocopy, slide duplication, slide mounting, and slide sorting equipment.

--Storage space for equipment and materials. Film storage area requires refrigeration. Dust free environment is essential.

--Darkroom area for processing, enlarging, and film/print drying equipment.

Type D. Production and duplication of motion picture materials requires:

--Dust free work space for film editing equipment and storage of edited film.

--Storage space for equipment and raw film. Film storage area requires refrigeration.

--Darkroom for processing of film. This is needed only in very large operations, as most motion picture film processing is done out of house by commercial processors.

--Studio areas to house lighting, sets, furniture, and equipment used in the production process. (In most systems, photography and motion picture production share a common studio area).

Type E. Production, duplication, and distribution of video materials requires:

--Studio area. Fairly large, high, open ceiling space to house cameras, lighting and sound equipment, sets, properties, and furniture used in the production process.

--Adjacent control room space for video and audio mixing equipment.

--Adjacent electronic maintenance space to house test and repair equipment and parts inventories.

--Adjacent work space to house video recording and duplication equipment. In the case of low power or cable TV distribution, this space often houses broadcast or telecast equipment with related electronic support equipment.

--Tape editing area to house editing equipment and taped materials storage (stack) areas.

--Storage space for portable "field production" equipment which is transported away from the central area for video recording. In large systems this may include garage space for mobile production vehicles

--Storage space for accumulated library of videotaped materials.

NOTE: As virtually all types of original production demands a process of instructional design, planning, and development, it is safe to assume that production functions will require conference, office, and clerical support areas.

IV. Administration Function - the management and administration of the overall media center operation requires:

--Office, conference, and clerical support areas.

While media resource or support centers are traditionally program-based rather than enrollment-based, two documents did provide assignable square footage (ASF) measurements which were related to FTE enrollments. Those documents, the State University of New York (SUNY) "Space Projection Criteria for Capital and Long-Range Facilities planning Purposes," and the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) "Learning Resource Center Space Planning Criteria," also show enough consistency in the identification of space types to be useful for comparative purposes.

Actual space allocations for media support at the University of Northern Colorado, and space allocations from the "Auraria Learning Resource Center Program Plan Space List Summary" have also been included. The ASF for each functional area was then broken down to identify the percent of total media center space and the volume of space per FTE enrolled student which was assigned to each media function.

Finally, the percentage of total media center space assigned to specific media functions has been compared to suggested space apportionment figures from the Learning Resource Association of California Community Colleges (LRA-CCC) "Facilities Guidelines, 1978."

Due to the limited amount of information on actual ASF in media resource centers, and on the criteria used to make space apportionments, the data are useful only for purposes of comparison as they demonstrate the lack of consistency in space allocations.

Of greater value may be the comparison of how space is internally apportioned within some media centers, as those figures indicate less inconsistency than overall space allocations.

SECTION J (con't)

COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ENROLLMENT 7,000-12,000

	SUNY	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		800	7.27	.0842
PHOTOGRAPHY		1020	9.27	.1073
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		1640	14.90	.1726
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		400	3.63	.0421
STUDIOS		1500	13.63	.1578
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1200	10.90	.1263
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		800	7.27	.0842
SHOPS AND STORAGE		1800	16.36	.1894
ADMINISTRATION		840	7.63	.0884
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		100	9.09	.1052
	TOTALS	11000	99.99	1.1578

COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ENROLLMENT 7,000-12,000

	FDOE	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		1450	8.68	.1526
PHOTOGRAPHY		1100	6.58	.1157
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		3700	22.15	.3894
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		750	4.49	.0789
STUDIOS		1450	8.68	.1526
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1450	8.68	.1526
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		1300	7.78	.1368
SHOPS AND STORAGE		5500	32.93	.5789
ADMINISTRATION				
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
	TOTALS	16700	99.99	1.7578

SECTION J (con't)

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 10,000	SUNY	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		1200	5.21	.1200
PHOTOGRAPHY		1020	4.43	.1020
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		3000	13.04	.3000
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		600	2.60	.0600
STUDIOS		2920	12.69	.2920
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1600	6.95	.1600
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		1200	5.21	.1200
SHOPS AND STORAGE		4800	20.86	.4800
ADMINISTRATION		5400	23.47	.5400
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		1260	5.47	.1260
	TOTALS	23000	99.99	2.3000

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 10,000	FDOE	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		1450	8.68	.1450
PHOTOGRAPHY		1100	6.58	.1100
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		3700	22.15	.3700
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		750	4.49	.0750
STUDIOS		1450	8.68	.1450
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1450	8.68	.1450
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		1300	7.78	.1300
SHOPS AND STORAGE		5500	32.93	.5500
ADMINISTRATION				
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
	TOTALS	16700	99.99	1.6700

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 10,000	UNC	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		900	9.28	.0900
PHOTOGRAPHY		520	5.36	.0520
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		1800	18.56	.1800
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		1500	15.46	.1500
STUDIOS		2304	23.75	.2304
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		728	7.50	.0728
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES				
SHOPS AND STORAGE		1135	11.70	.1135
ADMINISTRATION		690	7.11	.0690
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		120	1.23	.0120
	TOTALS	9697	99.99	.9697

SECTION J (con't)

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 20,000	SUNY	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		2000	5.86	.1000
PHOTOGRAPHY		1400	4.10	.0700
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		5000	14.65	.2500
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		1000	2.93	.0500
STUDIOS		6000	17.58	.3000
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1600	4.68	.0800
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		1400	4.10	.0700
SHOPS AND STORAGE		6000	17.58	.3000
ADMINISTRATION		7200	21.10	.3600
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		2520	7.38	.1260
	TOTALS	34120	99.99	1.7060

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 20,000	FDOE	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		1850	10.42	.0925
PHOTOGRAPHY		1300	7.32	.0650
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		4000	22.53	.2000
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		900	5.07	.0450
STUDIOS		1450	8.16	.0725
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1450	8.16	.0725
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		1300	7.32	.0650
SHOPS AND STORAGE		5500	30.98	.2750
ADMINISTRATION				
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
	TOTALS	17750	99.99	.8875

UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENT 20,000	AURARIA	ASF	% OF TOTAL	ASF PER FTE
GRAPHICS		950	7.23	.0475
PHOTOGRAPHY		900	6.85	.0450
EQUIP AND MATERIALS CIRCULATION		1000	7.61	.0500
EQUIP MAINTENANCE		1300	9.90	.0650
STUDIOS		3700	28.19	.1850
TV-AUDIO DISTRIBUTION		1575	12.00	.0787
AUDIO-RADIO SERVICES		450	3.42	.0225
SHOPS AND STORAGE		1300	9.90	.0650
ADMINISTRATION		1050	8.00	.0525
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		900	6.85	.0450
	TOTALS	13125	99.99	.6562

SECTION J (con't)

PERCENT OF TOTAL ASF ASSIGNED BY FUNCTION

	SUNY	FDOE	AURARIA	UNC	LRA-CCC	AVERAGE
PRODUCTION	32.24	32.23	45.69	38.40	49.00	39.51
DISTRIBUTION AND STORAGE	39.98	63.07	29.51	37.76	25.00	39.06
MAINTENANCE	3.06	4.69	9.90	15.46	10.00	8.62
OTHER	24.72		14.85	8.36	16.00	12.78

SECTION K

LIBRARY BUILDING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Library program should present basic information to call attention to points essential to library planning. Since no two libraries are alike, programs vary, but should leave certain basic background for planning. Parts typically include:

1. Information about the institution and its objectives.

2. The library and a description of its requirements.

3. Information about special building areas. This should include requirements for readers, seating accomodations, number of volumes and other materials to be housed, and spatial and facility recommendations for the staff.

4. Basic needs and spatial requirements.

5. Spatial relationships - in written, tabular or diagram form.

6. Provisions for growth.

This should be supplemented by copies of the institutions:

1. Policy on user access.

2. Collection development policy.

3. Library goals and objectives as reflected in the campus master plan.

GLOSSARY

Academic Library	The library of a community college, four-year college, or a university.
Access	A way or means of obtaining information or materials.
Assignable Square Feet	Area available for direct library purposes. It includes meeting rooms and conference areas: space for staff and for services to users, including public service desks and the public catalog area; stack and related storage areas for the collection; space for copying, audiovisual, and other equipment; and aisles between stack ranges, furniture equipment, and functional areas.
Association of Public College and University Presidents (APCUP)	A voluntary association of the presidents of the ten Colorado state four-year colleges and universities and the four chancellors of the University of Colorado which meets monthly to exchange ideas, discuss common concerns, and discuss implications of any legislative action affecting higher education.
Bibliographic Utility	"An organization that maintains a large online bibliographic data base and provides to its customer libraries products and services (both on and offline) using that data base." Bibliographic utilities are dynamic organizations, continually developing additional capabilities and modifying existing subsystems. There are currently four bibliographic utilities: OCLC (Online Computer Library Center, serving libraries of all sizes), RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network, serving large research libraries), UTLAS (University of Toronto Library Automation Systems, serving Canadian libraries), and WLN (Washington Library Network, a regional utility serving the Pacific Northwest). From "Understanding the Utilities; an introduction to the Birth and Development of the Major Online Bibliographic Utilities," American Libraries, XI, 5 (May, 1980), p. 262.

GLOSSARY (con't)

Collection	An accumulated group of library materials. This can be a total accumulation of all library materials provided by a library for its clientele or a group of library materials having a common characteristic, such as a pamphlet collection film collection, history collection.
Colorado Academic Library Committee	A committee whose composition is discussed fully in the last recommendation.
Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL)	A voluntary alliance composed of six member libraries: University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Northern Colorado, Colorado School of Mines, the Auraria Library, University of Denver and the Denver Public Library.
Colorado Association of Community/Junior College Presidents (CACJCP)	A voluntary association of the presidents of the community and junior colleges which meets monthly to exchange ideas, discuss common concerns, and discuss implications of any legislative action affecting higher education.
Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)	A nine-member commission appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, charged with the planning and coordination of all state supported units of higher education. The commission's mission is to "promote the quality, diversity, access, and accountability" of higher education while "enhancing the equality of opportunity." More specifically, the commission seeks to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs, ensure the equitable allocations of resources, and provide an efficient coordination of policies.
Colorado Council for Library Development (CCLD)	An advisory council to the Colorado State Board of Education and the State Library concerning library needs and programs in the State.
Colorado Council of Academic Libraries (CCAL)	A voluntary organization of Library Directors of all four and two year private and public academic libraries. The Council meets semi annually to discuss mutual problems.

GLOSSARY (con't)

Colorado Department of Education (CDE)	Consists of (1) the State Board of Education, (2) the Commissioner of Education, Assistant Commissioners, and other employees of the Department, including the State Library. The Department carries out the policies of the Colorado Board of Education in exercising general supervision over the public schools of the State.
Colorado Organization for Library Acquisitions (COLA)	A subcommittee of CARL which makes non-subscription purchases from common funds in order to provide the state with resources which no individual library could afford. Housing of COLA purchases is distributed among member libraries.
Colorado State Library (CSL)	The Colorado State Library, a division of the State Department of Education, is charged by State statute with encouraging Statewide library development, provide continuing education opportunities for library staffs and governing boards, and coordinating resource sharing on a Statewide basis.
Colorado Union Catalog (CUC)	A Union catalog of author, title, and subject entries which incorporates the holdings of eighty-three Colorado libraries including public, academic, school, and special libraries. The Catalog is complete from 1974 to the present, and includes earlier holdings of ten libraries. There are currently 850,000 titles listed.
Computer Based Research	Provides information to library users through the use of automated resources.
Data Bases	Files of bibliographic or other information recorded on magnetic tape or disk for computer processing.
Facsimile	The electronic transmission of an exact duplicate of a page, a graphic, or a film image.
Hardware	The physical equipment in a data processing or other machine system (as contrasted with software).

GLOSSARY (con't)

Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS)	An annual U.S. Department of Education Survey of (HEGIS) all institutions of higher education which provides uniform data on higher education resources.
Holdings	The books, periodicals, and other materials in a library's possession.
Information	Includes facts and other recorded knowledge found in books, periodicals, newspapers, reports, audiovisual formats, magnetic tapes, data banks (bases), and other recorded media.
Interlibrary Cooperation	Agreements between and among libraries to participate in a specific process or service for mutual benefit.
Interlibrary Loan	Arrangement by which one library lends material to a second library in response to a user request which the second library cannot supply from its own collection.
Network	Two or more libraries and/or other organizations engaged in a common pattern of information exchange, through communications, for some functional purpose. A network usually consists of a formal arrangement whereby materials, information, and services provided by a variety of types of libraries and/or other organizations are made available to all potential users.
Non-assignable Space	Includes vestibules, lobbies, or other traffic areas, janitorial or custodial storage and service areas; rest rooms; elevator and stairway space; building corridors; mechanical areas; and other space not used specifically for library functions.
Online Computer Library Center (OCLC)	A series of computers at Columbus, Ohio, where cataloging information about books is stored in such a way that information about a given book, including a list of libraries owning it, can be called up on a TV-like screen by thousands of libraries throughout the nation. Through OCLC a book need be cataloged only once for many libraries.
Online Data Base Searching	Retrieval services involving direct interactive communication between the user at a terminal and the computer programmed to provide access to one or more data bases.

GLOSSARY (con't)

Protocols	Codes or rules prescribing correct or preferred methods or routines of accessing and using the resources and services of a network.
Regional Library Service System	Organization of multitype libraries (academic, public, school, and special) established to provide cooperative interlibrary services within a designated geographical area. Membership may include any type of publicly supported library.
Serial	A publication issued in successive parts, usually at regular intervals, and, as a rule, intended to be continued indefinitely.
Software	The intellectual instructions, such as a computer program, which govern machine operations.
Union List of Serials	A central multi-institutional listing of magazines, annuals, quarterlies, and other similar publications published at periodic intervals; the list also indicates the libraries which hold each item listed.
Volume	A physical unit of any printed typewritten, handwritten, mimeographed, or processed work contained in one binding or portfolio, hardbound or paperbound, which has been cataloged, classified, and/or otherwise prepared for use. include bound periodical volumes.
Volume Equivalents	Microform holdings should be determined as number of volume-equivalents, either by actual count or by an averaging formula which considers three reels of microform as one, and eight pieces of any other microformat as one volume-equivalent.
Wet Carrel	Station for microform readers, video cassette players, computer terminals, printers, audio listening, video listening/viewing, slide viewing, and similar equipment which require access to electrical power and/or cable or other transmission systems.

Note: All readers may wish to refer to the 1975 ACRL Standards for College Libraries.